MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH: Memorial of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois in opposition to abandonment by the Federal Government of the Illinois-Mississippi Canal (also known as the Hennepin Canal). Congress is urged to authorize and direct the United States Army Corps of Engineers to maintain the canal in its present state until the Congress authorizes the proper Federal agencies to convert and develop the canal and lake area for recreation and to make the necessary appropriations; and that the Congress designate the Illinois-Mississippi Canal and Sinnissippi Lake area as either (1) a national park or memorial or (2) a public recreational area under the supervision of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the impediments of the water-conservation program of the several States, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 5511. A bill for the relief of Clara Gabriel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5512. A bill for the relief of the Employers' Liability Assurance Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 5513. A bill to direct the Secretary of Interior to make certain changes in the Buford-Trenton project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5514. A bill for the relief of Jack Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 5515. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Polak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5516. A bill for the relief of Manuel, Elvira, and Gerardo Barrios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5517. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cardinale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 5518. A bill for the relief of Alexander and Charlotte Berkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5519. A bill for the relief of Dominick Lechich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 5520. A bill for the relief of Gerardus Emile Kokxhoorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 5521. A bill for the relief of Quan Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. R. 5522. A bill for the relief of Joseph Robin Groninger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 5523. A bill for the relief of Solange Renee Painter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5524. A bill for the relief of George Risto Divitkos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5525. A bill for the relief of Alberto Yurman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5526. A bill for the relief of Luigi Caddeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 5527. A bill to authorize the employment in a civilian position in the Office of the Secretary of Defense of Lt. Gen. Graves Blanchard Erskine, upon retirement from the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

303. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Massachusetts Congregational Conference and Missionary Society, Boston, Mass., relative to endorsing legislation for the admission of an additional number of immigrants above the regular quotas of the countries of their origin to enter the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

304. Also petition of the Kiwanis Club, Troy, N. Y., expressing the wish that the handling of the Niagara Power project be entrusted to private enterprise; to the Committee on Public Works.

305. Also, petition of Gertrude Daniels and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447 social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

306. Also, petition of Ever Harris and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447 social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

307. Also, petition of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Philadelphia, Pa., requesting support of Ukrainians and other captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain in their resistance to the Communist regime; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1953

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 28, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, beset by the perplexities of these calamitous days with all their fury and terror, let not our strength fail, nor the vision fade. Save us from blighting disillusionment and corroding cynicism. Make us alive and alert to the spiritual values which underlie all the struggle of these epic days. With a sense of empty futility we confess our utter inability to save our own souls and our world by our own lifting and devices. May the integrity and stability of our own personalities, freed of pettiness and prejudice and radiant with contagious good will which leaps all separating barriers, be channels through which Thy saving grace may flow for the healing of the nations. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 2, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 117) to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 660. An act for the relief of Frank B. Pindle;

H. R. 674. An act for the relief of Irene F. M. Boyle;

H. R. 786. An act for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar;

H. R. 812. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. India Taylor Palmi Stevenson;

H. R. 819. An act for the relief of Monika Klein;

H. R. 820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pia Biondi;

H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Betty Robertson and Irene Robertson;

H. R. 1106. An act for the relief of Hannelore Mayerl Fulbright;

H. R. 1141. An act for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky;

H. R. 1167. An act for the relief of W. A. Sampsel;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Kates and Ronald Kates;

H. R. 1754. An act for the relief of Dr. Manousos A. Petrohelos;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2187. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of William M. Smith;

H. R. 2413. An act for the relief of Matsue Hashimoto;

H. R. 2564. An act to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone;

H. R. 2604. An act for the relief of Lauri Allan Torni;

H. R. 3623. An act for the relief of Willard Chester Cauley;

H. R. 3831. An act for the relief of Panagiotes G. Karras;

H. R. 4126. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954;

H. R. 4424. An act for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly;

H. R. 4505. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 4540. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma;

H. R. 4823. An act to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas;

H. R. 4833. An act for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 4978. An act to repeal the act of September 30, 1950, authorizing the transfer to the State of Iowa of Fort Des Moines, Iowa;

H. R. 5349. An act authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to W. C. Pallmeyer and E. M. Cole; and

H. R. 5363. An act to amend section 14 of the act of June 25, 1948, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 261. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood control compact;

S. 380. An act to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans.;

S. 484. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

S. 1292. An act providing for the reconveyance to the town of Morristown of certain land included within the Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey;

S. 1334. An act for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith;

S. 1545. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots;

S. 1870. An act to extend the time for filing a report by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel established by the act of July 16, 1952;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl; and

H. R. 2366. An act for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. LONG were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FREAR was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow, because of a death in his family.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BRICKER, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call, and before proceeding with the unfinished business, Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business under the customary 2-minute rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Millikin
Barrett	Griswold	Monroney
Beall	Hayden	Morse
Bennett	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bridges	Hill	Pastore
Bush	Hoey	Payne
Butler, Md.	Holland	Potter
Byrd	Humphrey	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Flanders	Mansfield	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young
Gore	McClellan	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, unanimous consent has already been granted to Members of the Senate to transact routine business, has it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such consent has been granted.

BOOKLET ENTITLED "UNITED STATES SENATE"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls the attention of Senators to a booklet entitled "United States Senate," which has been placed on the desks of all Senators. Copies of it will be distributed in the galleries to guests of the Senate. It is a rather attractive booklet, and the Chair feels he should call it to the attention of Senators.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a printed copy of the report on the agricultural experiment stations, 1952, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, which is to take the place of a typewritten report on the same subject, transmitted to the Senate on January 2, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the calendar year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTS-IN-AID TO WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH—RESOLUTION OF WEST VIRGINIA PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION, CHARLESTON, W. VA.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the West Virginia Public Health Association at its May convention at Charleston, W. Va., relating to the proposed reductions in specific categorical grants-in-aid from the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the West Virginia State Department of Health.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following resolution, presented by E. E. Myers, M. D. Myers Clinic, Philippi, W. Va., was unanimously adopted by the membership of the West Virginia Public Health Association at the 29th Annual State Health Conference, Charleston, W. Va., May 8, 1953:

"Whereas the West Virginia Public Health Association views with alarm the proposed reductions in specific categorical grants-in-aid from the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the West Virginia State Department of Health; and

"Whereas although the defense of the Nation has imposed a heavy burden of taxation, it is recognized that the health of the people is an essential part of that defense, and that basic health services are necessary to preserve the health of the people; and

"Whereas the West Virginia Public Health Association, composed of 700 persons vitally interested in public health, including over 300 lay leaders in the State, wishes it to become known that such a reduction in funds will have a detrimental effect upon the public health program in general in the State of West Virginia and a disastrous effect upon certain programs where the proposed reductions are greatest; and

"Whereas the programs which will be most adversely affected, if reductions are made, are tuberculosis control, the mental health program, heart disease control, venereal disease control, and the hospital construction program; and

"Whereas in tuberculosis control this reduction would mean that the mass X-ray and diagnostic clinic program, through which over one-half the reported cases in West Virginia are discovered, would be cut in half; and

"Whereas in venereal disease control it would mean that the only remaining effective means of controlling the spread of disease would be the laboratory blood testing service; it would mean virtually the end of a local program of clinics, case investigation and followup and all health educational activities; and

"Whereas in heart disease control it would mean that all health educational activities of the State department of health would have to cease; and

"Whereas in the mental health program it would mean sharp curtailment of clinical services and the educational program; and

"Whereas in the hospital program it would mean postponement of much proposed construction with a consequent lowering of standards of hospital care in the State; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the West Virginia Public Health Association hereby goes on record as stating that the proposed reductions in grants-in-aid for public health purposes in West Virginia would endanger the health of the people of this State, and requests that the reductions in these budgetary items be reconsidered; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of West Virginia."

FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL GENERATING FACILITIES BY TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION OF RAILROAD AND PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of the State of Tennessee.

The commission urges that funds "as the Tennessee Valley Authority has found necessary and has recommended" be approved "to meet the present and immediately foreseeable future demands for electric energy in Tennessee" and adjoining States.

Mr. President, I hope that all Members will consider this resolution, adopted by a body of men who are sworn to represent the public interest, and who, by the nature of their duties are familiar with the need for power in our State and region.

The TVA budget, now being considered by the House committee, no longer provides the additional power-generating facilities that "the TVA has found necessary and has recommended." It has been cut $63,000,000 by the Budget Bureau. It now includes no funds for an extremely important addition to our generating capacity—a proposed steam plant at Fulton, near Memphis. In fact, it is a budget which forecasts a power shortage for the Tennessee Valley region by 1956, unless we Members of Congress restore the funds necessary for TVA to build this new generating plant.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of the State of Tennessee is an instrumentality or agency of the State government composed of three commissioners, elected by the people, and having, among other things, statutory authority to regulate, control and prescribe the rates to be charged by various public utilities performing intrastate services in Tennessee, including all privately owned corporations and firms engaged in the production, distribution and sale of electric power within the State of Tennessee; and

Whereas pursuant to this statutory authority the commission is required to be familiar with the facilities, resources and services rendered by such enterprises insofar as they operate within and serve the people of the State of Tennessee; and

Whereas with the exception of some 6 or 7 communities, most of them small, and all of them located adjacent to the boundaries of other adjoining States, all of the people of the State of Tennessee are supplied with electricity generated by the publicly owned facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority and (with one exception) distributed by municipalities, cooperatives, electric membership corporations and other instrumentalities not within the jurisdiction of this commission to regulate and control, so that Tennessee is virtually a 100 percent public-power State; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this commission that under existing conditions and circumstances the expansion of the generating facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the extent sought by that agency of the United States in its recommendations to Congress is the only way and manner in which the growing demands for electric energy in Tennessee, and the other States comprising the Tennessee Valley area can be promptly and efficiently supplied, and it is the further opinion of this commission that it is not feasible, practicable or economically sound to supply such demand by means of the supplementation of the services of the Tennessee Valley Authority through construction of privately owned generating and distribution facilities within this State: Be it therefore

Resolved by the Railroad and Public Utilities Commission of the State of Tennessee, That we respectfully petition the President of the United States to recommend, and the Congress to enact, legislation which will provide adequate funds for the construction of such additional generating facilities as the Tennessee Valley Authority has found necessary, and has recommended, in order to meet the present and immediately foreseeable future demands for electric energy in Tennessee and the adjoining States comprising what is known as the Tennessee Valley area; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to each member of the Tennessee delegation in Congress.

HAMMOND FOWLER, *Chairman.*
JOHN C. HAMMER, *Commissioner.*
CAYCE L. PENTECOST.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 3, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 261. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood-control compact;

S. 380. An act to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans.;

S. 484. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

S. 1292. An act providing for the reconveyance to the town of Morristown of certain land included within the Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey;

S. 1334. An act for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith;

S. 1545. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots; and

S. 1870. An act to extend the time for filing a report by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel established by the act of July 16, 1952.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2039. A bill for the relief of the city of Harriman school district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 2040. A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2041. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings for housing of Federal agencies or departments, including post offices, by executing purchase

contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRISWOLD (for himself and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska) (by request):

S. 2042. A bill for the relief of J. Trinidad de Anda-Munoz; and

S. 2043. A bill for the relief of Arturo Miranda Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2044. A bill for the relief of Louise Russu Sozanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 2045. A bill for the relief of Leon H. Callaway, Irwin F. Hall, Sylvester T. Harlin, Robert B. How, and Edward S. Waldron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2046. A bill for the relief of William L. Long; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Robert V. Fleming as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Owen Josephus Roberts as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DEFINITION OF SERVICE IN WOMEN'S ARMY AUXILIARY CORPS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request I introduce for reference to the Committee on Armed Services a bill defining service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

The bill is accompanied by a letter from the Department of Defense which explains the purpose of the bill.

I ask that the accompanying letter be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2040) to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter to accompany Senate bill 2040 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C. June 2, 1935.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the bill is to grant credit for service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, to any person who subsequently performed active military service in the Armed Forces, as active military service in World War II.

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps served with the Army under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War; members were, in appropriate circumstances, subject to the Articles of War. They served in similar positions with the same responsibilities as personnel of the Army and their pay scale was similar to that of the Army. Persons in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps were included in the term "persons in military service" and the term "persons in the military service of the United States" as used in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1178), as amended.

Members of the WAVES, Marines, and SPARS were actually commissioned or enlisted in a reserve component and as such were serving in an active military capacity while their counterparts in the Army were considered to be an auxiliary only. The inequality of not crediting service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps has been strongly emphasized in connection with the involuntary and voluntary recall to extended active duty of women reservists of the armed services. Such reservists who had Navy or Marine Corps service during the same period of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, become entitled to more active service credit for basic pay, retirement, and separation than the recalled women reservists with Women's Army Auxiliary Corps service.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the enactment of the proposed bill is in the interests of equitable treatment of women in the services insofar as concerns creditable service for the purposes of basic pay, retirement, and severance pay.

The Department of Defense has consistently opposed the crediting of civilian or quasi-military service as active military service, but since service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was military in nature, this proposal should not be construed as a precedent for the granting of similar benefits to other individuals whose service was not military in nature even though performed in an organization serving with the armed forces.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

S. 3078, 81st Congress, and S. 924, 82d Congress, were bills which had a similar purpose. S. 592, 83d Congress, is a bill which has a similar purpose.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the additional costs resulting from the enactment of this proposal will be nominal (Air, $57,000 per year for pay; Army, $60,000 for pay; OSD and Navy—none) which will be absorbed by the applicable available apropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. ADAMS,
General Counsel, Acting.

LEON H. CALLAWAY, IRWIN F. HALL, SYLVESTER T. HARLIN, ROBERT B. HOW, AND EDWARD S. WALDRON

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of certain former naval personnel.

The bill is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the Department of the Navy which explains its purpose.

I ask that the accompanying letter be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bill introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2045) for the relief of Leon H. Callaway, Irwin F. Hall, Sylvester T. Harlin, Robert B. How, and Edward S. Waldron, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter to accompany Senate bill 2045 is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, May 28, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is enclosed a draft of proposed bill "For the relief of Leon H. Callaway, Irwin F. Hall, Sylvester T. Harlin, Robert B. How, and Edward S. Waldron."

This proposal has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of the Navy recommends that it be enacted by Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this measure is to relieve the retired naval officers named therein of liability to repay to the United States certain sums of money determined to have been paid them for certain specific periods as retired pay, in violation of the provisions of the so-called dual-compensation law.

The facts and dates concerning the case of one of these officers, Irwin F. Hall, chief machinist, United States Navy (retired) are set out below, as representative of all of these cases. Each of the individuals named in the bill is in substantially the same plight as Hall, and each case has similar equities, although the sums of money involved vary considerably.

Mr. Hall, after completion of about 25 years' active duty in the Navy was, on July 2, 1946, transferred to the Fleet Reserve in the enlisted rate of chief machinist's mate. On June 1, 1950, he was placed on the retired list by reason of physical disability, and on April 5, 1951, it was determined, pursuant to section 10 of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605), as amended by subsection 8 (a) of the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 28), that the highest grade and rank in which he served satisfactorily in a temporary appointment during World War II was the commissioned warrant rank of chief machinist. Accordingly, he was on that day, April 5, 1951, advanced to chief machinist, retroactively effective from the date of retirement, and he was so notified.

Up to this point, the plight of Mr. Hall and the others here concerned is similar to the set of facts which prompted introduction of S. 3059 of the 82d Congress, a bill "For the relief of Harold S. Waller." Waller, and those situated like him, had been retroactively advanced to commissioned rank. They, like Mr. Hall, having been employees of the Federal Government during the time and earning from civilian employment and retired pay as an officer a total in excess of $3,000 per year, were then subject to checkage of their retired pay as a result of the operation of the dual-compensation law, section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 406). The Comptroller General held in the case of Mr. Waller (Comp. Gen. B-108117 of May 29, 1952) that the retired pay which was received for the period prior to the date of notice of advancement on the retired list to commissioned warrant officer rank was actually paid to the recipient as an enlisted man and that the payments were legal and proper when made. Hence, it was further held that the recipient acquired a vested right to the payments received prior to notice of advancement and

that the retroactive advancement could not legally subject him, retroactively, to the provisions of the dual-compensation law, so as to divest him of his vested right to the retired pay as an enlisted man during the period prior to notice of advancement.

The application of the foregoing holding of the Comptroller General to the case of Mr. Hall relieved him of liability to repay any of his retired pay for the period from June 1, 1950, to April 5, 1951.

At the time of the notification letter to Mr. Hall, April 5, 1951, the Department of the Navy was interpreting section 511 of the Career Compensation Act as prohibiting persons in Mr. Hall's category from drawing the pay of their officer grade prior to completion of 30 years' service, which in Mr. Hall's case had not occurred at that time. Subsequent to the date of the notification letter, however, it was learned by the Department of the Navy that persons in Mr. Hall's category were entitled to the pay of their officer grades from the effective date of their advancement thereto upon retirement, but computed under the laws in effect immediately prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act. The Department of the Navy, however, through an unfortunate and much regretted error, did not at this time increase Mr. Hall's retired pay to that of his commissioned grade, nor was he notified of his entitlement to that increase.

Mr. Hall continued in the foregoing status until August 14, 1952, on which date he resigned his civilian position under the Federal Government, on being put on notice that he might be subject to checkage under the dual compensation provisions of law. He then discovered that for the period April 5, 1951, the date of his notification of advancement to commissioned rank, until August 14, 1952, he was not entitled to his retired pay because his retired pay as a commissioned officer when combined with the compensation from his civilian position amounted to over $3,000 per year.

It is to be especially noted that during the 16-month period, Mr. Hall, in reliance on the notification letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, believed he was being paid retired pay on account of services as an enlisted man. Such pay is not subject to the dual compensation provisions. Further evidence of Mr. Hall's good faith can be seen in his immediate resignation from his civilian employment on receipt of notice.

The case of another retired officer so situated, Chief Electrician Edward S. Waldron, United States Navy (retired), has been presented to the Comptroller General for decision. It was believed possible that the holding referred to above (Comp. Gen. B–108117 of May 29, 1952) might be extended to the instant case. The Comptroller General held, however (Comp. Gen. B–110540 of January 2, 1953), that after the issuance of the order advancing the claimant to his commissioned rank, retired pay legally accrued to him in the rank to which advanced, and the fact that there was at the time a contra administrative view affords no basis for concluding that the claimant was not subject to the provisions of the dual compensation provisions of law from the date of the order advancing claimant to the status of a commissioned officer.

The Department of the Navy is of the opinion that to require repayment of their retired pay for the period here in question, by these five retired officers, is unjust. There appears to be no question but that each of these five officers accepted these payments in complete good faith, in reliance on representations of the Department of the Navy that they were so entitled. This Department regrets the series of circumstances which brought about this unfortunate situation and recommends enactment of the legislation for the relief of these officers.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal would result in a cost to the Government of $9,777.96.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. FLOBERG,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, CERTAIN JUDGES, AND ATTORNEYS — AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or placed on the Calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 660. An act for the relief of Frank B. Pindle;

H. R. 674. An act for the relief of Irene F. M. Boyle;

H. R. 786. An act for the relief of Yusuf (Uash) Lazar;

H. R. 812. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. India Taylor Palmi Stevenson;

H. R. 819. An act for the relief of Monika Klein;

H. R. 820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pia Biondi;

H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Betty Robertson and Irene Robertson;

H. R. 1106. An act for the relief of Hannelore Mayerl Fulbright;

H. R. 1141. An act for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky;

H. R. 1167. An act for the relief of W. A. Sampsel;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Kates and Ronald Kates;

H. R. 1754. An act for the relief of Dr. Manousos A. Petrohelos;

H. R. 2021. An act for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 2187. An act for the relief of Chiyoko Miki Tomono;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of William M. Smith;

H. R. 2413. An act for the relief of Matsue Hashimoto;

H. R. 2564. An act to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone;

H. R. 2604. An act for the relief of Lauri Allan Torni;

H. R. 3623. An act for the relief of Willard Chester Cauley;

H. R. 3831. An act for the relief of Panagiotes G. Karras;

H. R. 4126. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954;

H. R. 4424. An act for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly;

H. R. 4833. An act for the relief of Hormoz Mahmoud; and

H. R. 5363. An act to amend section 14 of the act of June 25, 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4823. An act to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas;

H. R. 4978. An act to repeal the act of September 30, 1950, authorizing the transfer to the State of Iowa of Fort Des Moines, Iowa; and

H. R. 5349. An act authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to W. C. Pallmeyer and E. M. Cole; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4505. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; and

H. R. 4540. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; placed on the calendar.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF AMOS J. PEASLEE, TO BE AMBASSADOR TO AUSTRALIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the nomination of Amos J. Peaslee, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador of the United States to Australia. Notice is given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, after 6 days have expired, under the committee rule.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JACOB S. TEMKIN, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 11, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Jacob S. Temkin, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE HARROLD CARSWELL, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 11, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of George Harrold Carswell, of Florida, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Florida, vice George Earl Hoffman, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CLARENCE H. SPENCE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hear-

ing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 11, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Clarence H. Spence, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware, vice Paul B. Messick, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Statement prepared by him on the subject of television channels for educational purposes.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Letters addressed to him on the subject of proposed immunity legislation.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Editorial entitled "The Sound Dollar: Mr. Eisenhower's Goal," published in the Salt Lake Tribune of May 28, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "Matter of Fact Talks With Foreigners," written by Joseph and Stuart Alsop in their syndicated column Matter of Fact, published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 1, 1953.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Samuel C. Waugh, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Austria, and also United States High Commissioner for Austria; and

James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Syria.

By Mr. BENNETT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

William D. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration.

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Harold Shantz, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Rumania, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CONVENTIONS WITH COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA RELATING TO EVASION OF TAXES ON INCOME, ESTATES OF DECEASED PERSONS, AND GIFTS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, transmitting Executive I, 83d Congress, 1st session, a convention between the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Australia, signed at Washington on May 14, 1953, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income; Executive J, 83d Congress, 1st session, a convention between the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Australia, signed at Washington on May 14, 1953, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons, and Executive K, 83d Congress, 1st session, a convention between the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Australia, signed at Washington on May 14, 1953, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on gifts. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the conventions, and the messages and conventions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's messages will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The messages from the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Australia, signed at Washington on May 14, 1953, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the convention. The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1953.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report by the Acting Secretary of State; (2) convention between the United States and Australia relating to taxes on income.)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Australia, signed at Washington on May 14, 1953, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the convention. The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1953.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report by the Acting Secretary of State; (2) convention between the United States and Australia relating to taxes on estates.)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Australia, signed at Washington on May 14, 1953, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on gifts.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to the convention. The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1953.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report by the Acting Secretary of State; (2) convention between the United States and Australia relating to taxes on gifts.)

UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions I have commented in the Senate on the crucial importance of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. I believe that my position on this great humanitarian organization is so well known as not to require elaboration.

At the present time I send to the desk a series of messages which have come to me from national and local groups in my own State and elsewhere throughout the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that all of these items be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 28, 1953.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The executive board, United States Committee for UNICEF, this morning resolved that it is in best interests of United States that our Government continue to support UNICEF; calls on United States Government to approve extension of UNICEF mandate as long as it continues perform useful work and enjoy confidence of governments and peoples; recommends that United States Government pledge $14 million for calendar year 1954 to UNICEF.

H. PANTALEONI,
Chairman.

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1953.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Since the General Federation of Women's Clubs has from its very inception been interested in the welfare of children, and since under the UNICEF program the children of war-torn countries have had some consideration from the United States, the women of the General Federation of Women's Clubs feel very anxious about this program.

Naturally the women of this federation are concerned with reduction of expenses because it is the women of the home who come face to face with the problems of consumer goods. Regardless of this, women feel earnestly that reductions should not be made in the field of child welfare—first because children are charges of adults and we are responsible for their welfare; second because properly fed, clothed, and educated children grow up into better citizens.

For these reasons the General Federation of Women's Clubs would like to have the enclosed statement included in the record of your hearings which are to be held in the near future according to information that has come to my desk.

SALLY BUTLER,
Director, Legislative Research.

CONTINUED APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

I am Sally Butler, legislative research director of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, which has a membership of five and one-half million women in the United States with a voting membership of 815,000. The General Federation supports or opposes legislation only after it has been given authority to do so through resolutions adopted at national conventions.

All except emergency resolutions are mailed in the Convention Call to member clubs 6 weeks before the national meeting. This enables them to take action and, if desired, instruct their delegates.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, composed as it is of many of the mothers of the United States of America and of the world, deplores the fact that there has been an inclination on the part of Congress to cut the appropriation which has been set up to care for the children whose lives have been shattered by the evils of and aftermath of wars.

As American women our members in the United States are aware that we must balance the budget of the United States Treasury. But we feel certain it is not a good policy to let the children who need rehabilitation and proper care suffer further. We believe such a policy would likely result in losing friends for the United States rather than making friends. We know you cannot buy friendship. We know, too, if we help to feed, clothe, and educate, we make it possible for children to grow up into healthy young people. The knowledge that the United States of America helped them when they needed aid most will likely cause them to become citizens who will understand that the United States has no greedy purposes. These young people who are tomorrow's citizens will know the true greatness of our beloved country.

We, therefore, feel that the United States should continue to participate in the work of UNICEF by continuing its contribution to the fund, and would urge authorization for the full amount as it appears in the 1954 legislation being considered.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Madison, Wis., May 22, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: So that you may know of the action in regard to appropriations to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund taken by the League of Women Voters at its State convention this week we are sending you the text of a telegram sent to Secretary of State Dulles and to Wisconsin Congressmen DAVIS and LAIRD. Our telegram read:

"The League of Women Voters of Wisconsin in convention assembled urges the immediate appropriation of the remainder of those funds authorized for the UNICEF by the 82d Congress. Sixteen million four hundred and eighty-one thousand dollars was authorized and only $6,666,667 so far appropriated. The invaluable program of the U. N. Children's Fund is in danger of collapse. Other nations have been increasing the size of their donations and services to the fund. The humanitarian and constructive aspects of the work for 60 million underprivileged and suffering children in the less developed areas of the world are everywhere recognized, and the United States contribution to this far-reaching U. N. agency creates good will throughout the world."

Yours very truly,
CARROLL GUNDERSEN
(Mrs. Alf H. Gundersen),
President.

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Green Bay, Wis., May 27, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It has come to my attention that our Government is not giving adequate support to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. It seems to me that here is one place where we must act quickly. Starving children can't wait. We as a nation will not be able to hold up our head with the rest of the nations in a position of respect if we are not willing to help the children of the world.

I urgently request you to do what you can to see that our Nation supports amply this program.

Feeling certain that you will see the wisdom of this course, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
WILLIAM A. RIGGS,
Pastor.

GREENDALE, WIS., *May 28, 1953.*

The Honorable Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

DEAR SIR: We have just finished reading an editorial about the United Nation's International Children's Emergency Fund in the June issue of the Parent's magazine. We feel that it is our obligation to see that the $9,814,000 authorized by the last Congress for the UNICEF, be appropriated as soon as possible. Will you please vote aye for the appropriation and do whatever you deem possible for the continuing adequate support of the fund by the United States.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. CLARENCE FREITAG.

UNIVERSAL GUARANTEED DISARMAMENT—UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, being mindful of the practice of the Senate not to have a prolonged morning hour, I ask unanimous consent, if it is appropriate to do so, that immediately following the transaction of routine business I may have the privilege of submitting a resolution and of speaking on it for not more than 14 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont, that immediately following the transaction of routine business the Senator from Vermont have the floor for the purpose of submitting a resolution and addressing the Senate for not more than 14 minutes? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMERICANS OF ITALIAN EXTRACTION AND THE ITALIAN ELECTIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Massachusetts I have the honor to represent several hundred thousand Americans of Italian extraction, many of whom immigrated to the United States directly or are the sons and daughters of Italians who came here at the turn of the century to build their homes and raise their families. They have made a singular contribution to the life of our States and country. They have a deep devotion to God and to democratic principles. They are the strong links in the chain that has bound us to Italy.

In 1948, they helped through letters to their friends and families to prevent the Communists from seizing control of Italy. They are writing and cabling again in 1953, and I urge them to continue through the remainder of this vital week.

We have no desire to interfere in the affairs of the Italian people and they have repeatedly shown that they are wholly capable of managing their own destinies, but we do want them to know that we are thinking of them, and that we have faith that they will continue to march with the free nations of the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 4974, the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], proposed as a substitute for the part of the committee amendment inserting certain words on page 34 between lines 4 to 24.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Vermont has the floor for 14 minutes.

UNIVERSAL GUARANTEED DISARMAMENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on February 26, 1951, a little more than 2 years ago, a resolution calling for universal guaranteed disarmament was read on this floor, and a number of Senators spoke in favor of it. At this time, more than 2 years later, I am submitting a second concurent resolution for guaranteed disarmament, and I am joined in it by the following cosponsors: Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. MONRONEY.

While the earlier resolution was never acted upon by the Senate or by the House, and while it was never even reported from committee, it nevertheless had its effect. It played its part in getting guaranteed disarmament adopted as a definite policy by our Government. This, in turn, played a deciding part in having a committee on disarmament set up in the United Nations. That committee very properly combined the committee for the control of conventional weapons and armed forces with the new responsibilities for the control of atomic weapons.

Every 2 years the complexion of Congress changes by elections for all the Members of the House and for one-third of the membership of this body. Every 4 years a presidential election is held, and in 1952 this resulted in a Republican victory, so that we have a completely new administration. In view of the changes in the House and Senate and the complete change in the administration, it seems important and timely for the Congress again to consider a disarmament resolution, in order that the United Nations may know that we continue to be of the same mind as before, and in order that our own people may be reassured that there has been no change in policy with the coming of new faces into the administrative and legislative branches of our Government.

In the more than 2 years that have passed, the Disarmament Commission has been set up in the United Nations. The Soviet Government and its captive satellites continue their opposition to a guaranteed disarmament. Yet the evils of the continued armament race not only remain but grow.

The people of the Soviet and its satellites are burdened beyond any easy stretch of the imagination by the weight of the tremendous percentage of the total effort these countries are putting into the preparation of arms and armaments and the maintenance of armed forces. Our Western allies are burdened also by the existing military requirements. Alone among the great powers, we have been able to maintain a high standard of living simultaneously with a heavy defense effort.

Yet in spite of our ability to produce both guns and butter, to use a familiar phrase, our people are in this armament race from grim necessity, not from any warlike desires or policies.

Our people know that we desire nothing that the Soviet Government or its satellites possess in the way of territory, natural riches, industrial equipment, or any other thing. We desire only to live in peace with all peoples, and we hope that they desire to live in peace with us.

It is incredible that we should be pitted against each other, to the spiritual harm and economic disadvantage of all of us, when the means for insuring peace and prosperity can so directly be attained by means of supervised disarmament, to the attainment of which this resolution is aimed.

Mr. President, I shall now proceed to read the concurrent resolution:

Whereas the peoples of the earth are plunged into an accelerating armament race, which imposes crushing burdens on their economic well-being, threatens their lives, and impinges on their basic freedoms; and

Whereas the American people and their Congress ardently desire peace and the achievement of a system under which armaments can be rendered unnecessary while at the same time the national security of our own and other nations will be protected; and

Whereas armaments can only be eliminated if all nations, without exception, reach agreements looking toward universal disarmament covering all weapons down to those needed for the maintenance of domestic and international order and if these agreements provide for progressive disarmament and enforcement operating under law agreed upon through an international agency; and

Whereas until such secure international disarmament agreements are reached, both the security of the United States and its ability to espouse the cause of peace depend in good part upon its continued military strength; and

Whereas the Congress has heretofore declared its intention to continue to exert maximum effort to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces, as contemplated in the charter, and agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction, and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violations and evasions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it continues to be the declared purpose of the United States to obtain, within the United Nations, agreements by all nations for enforceable universal disarmament, down to those arms and forces needed for the maintenance of domestic order, under a continuing system of United Nations inspection, control, and international police protection; to this end, be it further

Resolved, (1) That the President continue to search for a practical program for complete enforceable world disarmament, including efforts to solve the scientific and technical problems involved in the effective control and elimination of atomic and other weapons capable of mass destruction, and also to explore whether or not changes in the United Nations Charter may be required for the achievement and enforcement of world disarmament, and whether existing United Nations agencies, such as the Disarmament Commission, could be more fully utilized.

(2) That the President (a) develop a plan for the transfer of resources and manpower now being used for arms to constructive ends at home and abroad; and (b) recommend similar action to the United Nations and member states, such plans to give due consideration to the possibilities for vastly increased trade with other nations, and to the vital share which the United States and other nations should undertake in helping to overcome hunger, disease, illiteracy, and despair which have been among the prime causes of past wars.

Resolved, That the United States proposals and endeavors for world disarmament be repeatedly and continuously made known to our own people and to the world as evidence of our honest determination to achieve world peace, and as an incentive to the peaceful aspirations of other peoples.

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and to each United Nations delegate, and that copies be transmitted to the presiding officer of every national parliament, congress, and deliberative assembly throughout the world.

Mr. President, I submit the concurrent resolution for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), submitted by Mr. FLANDERS (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to commend the Senator from Vermont upon having submitted the concurrent resolution, and having taken the leadership in saying to the peoples of all the world, not merely to the people of the United States, that there is a ray of hope; that we do not accept war as inevitable, and that we do not accept the increasingly costly program of competitive armaments as the only thing the Congress can offer as an insecure alternative.

Mr. President, the increasingly competitive situation in the matter of world armaments is discouraging. The mounting cost of the race in the production of airplanes, atomic bombs, and other means of accomplishing destruction is such that if that race is to continue the world can only expect bankruptcy or war, and war, of itself, would mean bankruptcy, and would create problems which would be more difficult perhaps than those with which the war began.

Mr. President, the world learned, or should have learned, as the result of World War II, that war creates problems involving enormous expenses and which are seemingly more difficult of solution than those which existed at the time the war started.

So, Mr. President, the effort of the Senator from Vermont should be commended as indicating our intention to try to find an alternative to the continual round of competition in arms.

We shall continue, of course, to develop a position of strength to deter and discourage aggression and to be able to speak effectively in world councils, but we shall also seek ways to free the people of the world from a competitive race in arms. I applaud the Senator from Vermont for his efforts in this direction.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to compliment the Senator from Vermont for submitting a concurrent resolution designed to promote disarmament. I believe the people of America and the people of all other countries should exert all their available driving force to bring about disarmament. In my opinion, every effort should be made to get the peoples of the world to believe in disarmament, and to wean them away from the idea that their problems can be settled by war. The last two wars have demonstrated, I believe, that, though it is possible to win on the battlefield, in the skies, and on the sea, the final victory must come in the winning of the minds of men.

I hope the concurrent resolution submitted by the distinguished Senator from Vermont will lead the way, not only for the Congress, but for all the nations and peoples of the world to drive forward to a solution of their problems, not by means of the sword, but by peaceful means. I fervently hope we shall be able to achieve that goal.

Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall yield first to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, but, before doing so, I should like to say that the support given to the concurrent resolution, both by way of signatures and by way of comments on the floor of the Senate, is most important and most useful, and will assist in assuring both foreign nations and the people of our own country that we mean what we say.

I now yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wish to comment most favorably on the attitude of the Senator from Vermont. He deserves both commendation and support. I should like to say that I believe the people of America must soon determine whether our greatest danger lies in the threat of aggression on the part of communism from without, or in insolvency from within. Insolvency would mean distress and chaos.

Mr. President, I have supported and worked for a strong military organization all my life, and I have sincerely felt that great military power on the part of the United States would result in peace for the world. However, the last two World Wars, and the possibility of a third, have convinced me that it is impossible for us to become sufficiently strong to achieve that goal; indeed, it is almost impossible to provide sufficient money to assure an adequate defense. The defense of a people, Mr. President, must be within the minds of the people.

If we in America will all get behind the resolution submitted by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, and will think in terms of peace, I believe our attitude will come to be accepted across the seas, and our fervent hope for peace throughout the world may be realized. If the present armament race continues, all the nations of the world will go bankrupt; and that would mean chaos. I again commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his timely action.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets to announce that the time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from Vermont be extended for 30 seconds, to permit me to join with him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I should like to submit a unanimous-consent request that the Senator from Vermont be allowed to retain the floor for sufficient time to allow several of us, who desire to do so, to comment on the concurrent resolution. It is a very important measure. If I may, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont be allowed to retain the floor for not more than 15 minutes, so as to allow Senators, who may desire to do so, to ask questions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair agrees with the Senator from Alabama that this is a very important matter. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Alabama is agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am glad to join the Senator from Vermont in his concurrent resolution, and to associate myself with his remarks on the subject covered by it. One of our most important obligations today is to convince the people of the world that we are not arming ourselves for aggressive purposes, and that we desire to disarm ourselves as quickly as possible, consistent with security. That is the objective of the concurrent resolution, and I am glad the Senator from Vermont has submitted it.

Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. SPARKMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

WE STAND BEHIND THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and other Senators in submitting the concurrent resolution. I congratulate them upon the leadership they have shown.

I consider this resolution a necessary supplementary step to the proposals of President Eisenhower in his address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. In that address the President outlined a broad foreign-policy program which included the control of armaments and atomic weapons. He declared that success in that program would release the productive energies of the world for constructive, rather than destructive, uses, thereby further promoting peace in the world. The President said:

> The peace we seek, founded upon decent trust and cooperative effort among nations, can be fortified—not by weapons of war—but by wheat and by cotton; by milk and by wool; by meat and by timber and rice.

Let us by this concurrent resolution show the other governments of the world that the Congress of the United States stands firmly behind our President in his desire to secure peace through cooperation with other nations.

Let us show that the most powerful nation of the world abhors war and that it considers war no longer a weapon of power, but an instrument of suicide.

Let us, by our actions here, seek to lift the hearts and minds of men everywhere to a goal and a program that is as bold creatively as the atom bomb is destructively.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I desire to express to the distinguished Senator from Vermont my appreciation of his taking the leadership in submitting the concurrent resolution. I have been happy to join with him in so doing, and I am delighted that so many Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, with no view of partisanship whatever, have also joined with the Senator from Vermont.

I take pleasure, Mr. President, in recalling that when the late distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Brien McMahon, offered his resolution on June 6, 1950, I joined with him in that resolution. It may be recalled that he made a stirring speech on the floor of the Senate in which, for the first time, he invited the attention of the world to the real possibility of peace if the peoples of the world were relieved of the tremendous burden of carrying on an armaments race. Certainly, if that was true at that time, it is now even more true.

Not very long after the speech of the then Senator from Connecticut I was appointed a delegate to the United Nations. I had the distinction, the honor, and the privilege of representing our Government as a delegate to the Fifth General Assembly. I was a member of the Economic Committee. I well recall that when in that committee I presented the views of the United States Government, there was discussed the tremendous burden which had been imposed upon us because the great powers of the world had not found it possible to work together after they agreed on the charter of the United Nations. At that time I threw out this challenge—and I did so with the full accord of the United States Government—that if all the nations of the world would join with us in a work-

able plan whereby it would be possible to bring to an end the terrible armaments race, we would be willing to share a goodly part of the savings effected thereby with other nations in helping them to help themselves in conserving their resources.

Mr. President, during the time I served as a delegate to the United Nations, I became impressed with the idea that a great portion of the world, not just the large nations of which we so often speak, but the great majority of the nations and of the peoples of the world, was afraid of the armaments race in which the world has become engaged.

I have never subscribed to the idea that the United States as a nation was warlike or wanted war. I know we want peace. Yet, Mr. President, Russia and her satellites have succeeded in instilling in the minds of people in many areas of the world the idea that we are warlike. I have sometimes thought that in the great program and undertaking of building up the defenses of the free world it is likely to be forgotten that the ultimate objective which we are always seeking is a peaceful world. I believe this resolution, in which I have the honor to join with the distinguished Senator from Vermont and with many other Senators, points again to that ultimate objective. It serves notice on the world that we are ready to stop the armaments race whenever it becomes possible to do so safely and honorably and are prepared to join with the other nations of the world in building permanent peace and prosperity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks an article which appeared in several newspapers. It is dated Princeton, N. J., May 26. It is a Gallup poll which shows the attitude the people of the country take toward this kind of a program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMS SAVING BACKED FOR POVERTY USE

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 26, 1953.—President Eisenhower's proposal to devote a substantial part of any savings achieved by real disarmament to worldwide human betterment meets with the approval of a substantial majority of Americans.

A coast-to-coast institute survey finds that virtually 2 out of every 3 voters—65 percent—stand ready to join with other nations in such a plan, 26 percent are opposed, and 9 percent express no opinion.

Here is the question which interviewers asked:

"If defense spending can be safely cut, would you favor or oppose having the United States, along with other nations, use part of the money they would save to help the needy countries of the world?"

The vote	*Percent*
Favor	65
Opposed	26
No opinion	9
Total	100

Opinion on the question is relatively uniform throughout the various major segments of the population.

College-trained people are more inclined to favor the proposal than are persons with less formal education, as the following table shows:

	College	High school	Grade school
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Favor	74	65	61
Opposed	21	26	28
No opinion	5	9	11
Total	100	100	100

There are two especially interesting aspects of today's survey:

1. This is one of those rare issues on which both rank-and-file GOP and Democratic voters see exactly eye to eye, with 65 percent in each group voting in favor.

2. The occupational group most in favor of the plan is the Nation's farmers, with 74 percent approving. Next comes the professional and business group, with 71 percent in favor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont, first for taking the leadership in this matter and, second, for yielding to me at this time for these few remarks.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Alabama for their leadership in preparing and presenting this resolution, of which I am very proud to be a cosponsor. I think it is timely and fitting, and it represents the views and the mood of the American people. I have been one of those who have been strongest in advocacy of full military strength so long as the threat of Soviet aggression remains. I shall continue to be a strong advocate of such policy. I believe we should be making a great mistake, so long as the threat of aggression persists, if we failed to keep ourselves and our allies as strong militarily as we possibly can. At the same time I realize perfectly well that the fight against Soviet aggression, against the threat that undoubtedly exists, should not be made solely by military strength.

So, Mr. President, as we go along in the months and possibly the years which lie ahead to maintain our military strength as I believe we must we should simultaneously make every effort, as has been suggested by this fine resolution, to win the hearts and minds of the peoples of the free world and to convince them and the people of Russia and her satellites that we have no warlike designs, but are willing to make sacrifices for peace in the same degree we have been willing to make sacrifices for our own military defense. I think there is nothing more important than, first, to keep the door wide open for peaceful settlement of every difference that divides the countries of the world, and, second, aggressively to fight for peace by proving our good faith and our desire for peace.

I again wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleagues in commending the Senator from Vermont for his resolution and for the spirit in which he has offered it. I fully agree with its purpose and objective. I happen to be one who joined with the Senator from Vermont and other Senators in sponsoring this resolution as an expression of policy and of faith on the part of the Government of the United States.

I regret to say that during recent years all too often our country has lost its initiative as being a nation working in behalf of peace. The initiative at times has been lost because of the subtle propaganda and strategy of the Communist conspiracy and the propaganda forces of communism which Russia has been able to rally. To me it has always seemed somewhat paradoxical that the Soviet propagandists who represent the warmakers should be able to cloak themselves in the disguise of peacemakers. It has always been somewhat alarming, to me, that those who practice regimentation should be those who appeal to other peoples of the world in the spirit of liberty.

In an era of warmaking, I believe this resolution will do much to reassert again American leadership as a peace-loving nation.

The people of the world look to the United States as a nation of compassion, generosity, service, fair play, and equality. Our secret weapon has never been the atomic bomb; our strength has never been in our Armed Forces. It has been in the spirit of human liberty for which America stands, and in our generosity, kindness, and humaneness which have permeated the history of this land.

Think, Mr. President, what a wonderful world this could be if the energies which are now directed to making instruments of destruction could be directed to the making of instruments of peace and construction. Imagine what we could do in the work of preventing disease and eradicating the causes of poverty if we were to turn our energies and the great knowledge of modern mankind upon the solution of these great problems. Think what we could do for education and for better health for millions of people throughout the world if we spent a fraction of the money we now spend on armaments for education and for the physical welfare of mankind.

I believe, Mr. President, we can take hope from the resolution which is now before the Senate, which literally demands that we turn our swords into plow shares and use our energy and spirit for the good of all mankind.

I heartily commend the Senator from Vermont for his resolution. No Senator in this body could better sponsor it because of his own spirit and his own sincere attitude in the field of world peace.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to thank the Senator from Vermont for the opportunity that has been given to me to

join with him in submitting the concurrent resolution. I had not read the resolution, since it had not been called to my attention.

Mr. FLANDERS. That was due to my oversight.

Mr. BRICKER. A series of experimental bursts of atom bombs has just been finished in the great western part of our country. No one but scientists can understand fully the destructive effects of those instruments of war. With these bonds, we have the power today to obliterate nations, and the temptation to do so at this hour is greater than ever before in history.

I sincerely hope that the resolution will be given consideration by the Senate, and be brought to the attention of all the nations of the world. I thank the Senator from Vermont for permitting me to join with him in submitting it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I concur particularly in the words which the Senator from Ohio has just spoken.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand scores of statements, most of them brief, but all of them supporting the idea of guaranteed disarmament. Their very volume attests to the widespread and great interest in this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the statements may be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

THE GOAL: DISARMAMENT

Progress toward disarmament is clearly dependent upon progress toward collective security and political settlements. While recognizing that armed strength is necessary to defend freedom in an armed world, our goal is the abolition of war.

The United States must give new emphasis to its efforts for agreement in the United Nations Disarmament Commission. The struggle for a progressive reduction of armaments, both atomic and conventional, secured through United Nations inspection, verification and control, is of the highest urgency.

Effective world disarmament would release vast sums which could be directed toward raising standards of living and relieving human misery throughout the world. In anticipation of armament limitation the United States should plan now for the redirection of resources and personnel to constructive purposes.

No nation in this atomic age can be indifferent to the threat to its survival inherent in total war. In the interest of common survival all nations must quicken their efforts within the United Nations if they are to free the world of the burdens and fears of armaments and the scourge of war. (Resolution adopted at Washington, D. C., March 3, 1953, at the third annual conference on United Nations Responsibility for World Leadership called by the American Association for the United Nations.)

The New England Conference of the Methodist Church meeting in Melrose, Mass., May 20–24, 1953, passed the following resolution:

"UNIVERSAL DISARMAMENT AND WORLD REHABILITATION

"We endorsed the general proposal for reduction and elimination of armaments and the use of part of the funds saved for world reconstruction and rehabilitation, as outlined in the President's speech of April 16, 1953, and urge our Senators and Representatives to give support to the measures introduced to advance this program."

Methodist: We must keep disarmament before the nations as they seek an alternative to war. We seek firmer grounds of security in mutual understanding, international cooperation, and the use of our economic resources for better standards of living throughout the world (resolution adopted by the 1952 general conference).

SOME STATEMENTS AND RESOLUTIONS ON WORLD DISARMAMENT BY NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION

"Whereas a congressional group composed of prominent members of both political parties has introduced a resolution urging the President to place a permanent invitation before the United Nations to join in action moving toward universal disarmament of all weapons: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we heartily endorse this high aim, and petition our President and the Congress to take the necessary steps through the United Nations to halt the vast armament race before it is too late by supporting a call for a world conference on disarmament." (From resolutions adopted by the Council on Christian Social Progress of American Baptist Convention, June 1951.)

2. AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

"For the immediate future the United States faces a host of issues in the United Nations. Among the most urgent needs are:

"1. Persistent efforts as pointed out by President Truman to the United Nations to promote universal and effective disarmament, inclusive of all weapons of war, not only to stop a suicidal armaments race and thus to move toward peace, but to release the resources so desperately needed to attack hunger, disease, and ignorance throughout the world. Only thus can the United Nations meet the demands of peoples who might otherwise in desperation turn to the false salvation offered by totalitarian forces." (From statement of foreign policy in March 1951 issue of ADA World.)

3. AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

"Armaments are both a symptom and a contributing cause of international tensions. Their very existence is evidence of distrust and suspicion and a cause of additional anxiety. The great expansion of a suspicion-breeding secrecy on both sides of the Iron Curtain during and since World War II has created additional uncertainty and insecurity. In a dilemma where suspicion breeds armaments and armaments augment suspicion, successful negotiation at any point may help break the vicious circle. In the world of 1952 an agreement in Korea or Germany would certainly help the disarmament discussions, but the reverse of this would also be true. This being the case, real progress toward peace requires new efforts to reduce armaments drastically without delay. Whichever way we turn, we are aware that the major problems facing the United Nations are bound up with and rendered more insoluble by armaments. It is for this as well as for religious and moral reasons that we believe mankind's next step is to disarm, and that the time for disarmament is now." (From Toward Security Through Disarmament, a report prepared for American Friends Service Committee, 1952.)

4. AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION

"Whereas peoples of the world desire positive action which promotes peace; and

"Whereas a stable program for peace depends largely upon programs on the issues of trade, commerce, poverty, civil liberties, self-government, and national independence under the Charter of the United Nations: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the American Unitarian Association commends the efforts of the American Friends Service Committee in initiating programs of peace and that this association joins with the Friends in support of their declaration that a "worldwide attack on poverty, disease, hunger, and outworn social and economic patterns must be launched simultaneously with renewed effort toward disarmament and the establishment of world law." (Passed by the Unitarian Association, May 27, 1952.)

5. AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

"We recognize that an arms race among nations, because it increases world tensions to the point where a just and peaceful settlement of differences is made well-nigh impossible, and because it creates a self-sustaining spiral of arms and more arms almost inevitably leads to war. Therefore we maintain that it should be the permanent policy of the United States to champion the cause of complete world disarmament with effective international inspections. We maintain further that our Government should work relentlessly to sell such a program to all the peoples and governments of the world, with all the ingenuity, vigor, and forcefulness at its command, through the United Nations and via all the propaganda media at its disposal." (From international affairs program adopted at the fifth national convention, New York City, 1951.)

6. CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

"The organization of the United Nations was and is the greatest step forward in the effort to maintain national security and international peace through international cooperation. So far as it is or can be effective the United Nations, as well as its specialized agencies, should be given every support.

"The development of the United Nations into an effective organization for the maintenance of international peace and security means the amendment of the Charter to compel submission of all international justifiable disputes to adjudication by law and to maintain international peace and security.

"Pending the achievement of these aims all the potentialities of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies should be explored and made use of toward the elimination of violence in the settlement of international disputes." (From the Catholic Association for International Peace pamphlet: toward an Integrated World Policy, 1950.)

7. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

"The possible possession of atomic and even more powerful weapons by many nations adds new emphasis to the need for effective international control of atomic energy. We believe that while there can be no compromise on the principle of a truly effective control which will make surprise atomic attacks impossible, every avenue should be explored in the hope of reaching agreement.

"In this we are in accord with the General Assembly of the United Nations, which, on November 23, 1949, passed a resolution stating its conviction that an international cooperative effort can avoid the dangers of use of atomic energy for war and hasten its development for peaceful ends, and calling upon Government to do everything in their power to make possible, by the acceptance of international control, the effective prohibition and elimination of atomic weapons." (From Declarations on International, Commercial and Political Policy, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1952.)

8. FEDERATION OF AMERICAN SCIENTISTS

"The evident progress in thermonuclear weapons research reported by the ARC and the press drives home with renewed force the

need for some alternative to the present armaments race. We may be sure that we are not the only country engaged in such research. We must have no illusions of security based on monopoly of a superweapon. In fact, no nation is secure against the hydrogen bomb and our people must realize that the threat is nowhere greater than here. The kind of security we need and want can be had only by building a stable peace.

"Our country must distinguish between the false security of bombs and the genuine security, which requires a slow, step-by-step, but positive approach to peace by mutual agreement, by gradual disarmament, and by a worldwide economic reconstruction and development.

"The nations of the world are loading the balance with a terrible weight for destruction. A greater weight must now be found for the side of real security and peace.

"Almost 3 years ago we urged establishment of a top-level commission with broad perspective to make a fresh start on our atomic policy. A State Department advisory panel has this objective in part and a release of their finding is eagerly awaited. The entire problem must be a matter of the first and most urgent consideration by the new administration. Efforts toward international atomic control must be pushed forward in spite of present obstacles. The AEC announcement is a sober and grim reminder to the world that a way must be found to prevent the use of these and even more potent weapons to come." (Text of statement by Dr. Jules Halpern, chairman, Federation of American Scientists, November 1952.)

9. FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION

"We would encourage the systematic development of enforceable world law in the field of disarmament. This would include the power to supervise a universal program of disarmament, to administer effective inspection anywhere as insurance against the rearming of any nation, to prohibit the manufacture or possession of weapons not required for internal policing, to apprehend and bring to trial in world courts individuals or groups who violate world law in respect to the manufacture of illegal weapons or who violate other provisions for a disarmed world.

"Among the steps toward general disarmament we would recommend—

"(a) That the United States take the initiative in the United Nations in urging world disarmament. Our Government should come forward with a comprehensive plan for world-wide disarmament of all nations down to internal policing levels with effective supervision and inspection. Careful preparation should be begun now for the calling of an international disarmament conference.

"(b) That the United Nations be urged to establish an international commission to study the present armament burden on civilian economies and to determine how such expenditures can be shifted from unproductive military use without creating serious repercussions in employment and business activity.

"(c) That international agreements should be concluded—to abolish conscription; to eliminate weapons of mass destruction and preparation for bacteriological warfare; for the internationalization and demilitarization under the United Nations, of strategic waterways and the polar regions." (From Statement on Legislative Policy for 1951.)

10. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America believes it is essential that the United States exercise its moral leadership by demonstrating its determination to discover and develop peaceful alternatives to war.

"We welcome, therefore, the disarmament proposals laid before the General Assembly of the United Nations (November 18, 1951) by the United States, Great Britain, and France. Without presuming to pass judgment on the specifics of these proposals we believe they constitute a satisfactory basis for a workable program of progressive disarmament. Bold action by the General Assembly will be required if the race in armaments is to be stopped and the drift toward war arrested.

"We recognize that, pending the acceptance by all nations of a trustworthy system whereby all armaments, including atomic weapons, can be placed under international control, it is unavoidable that the United States should strengthen its military defenses. Our recognition of this fact, however, must not be construed to mean that we are ignorant of, or indifferent to, the dire consequences that may befall our own and other nations unless the race in armaments now under way can be stopped.

"As the production of atomic weapons is accelerated the danger will increase that these weapons may some day be used. As the race in armaments continues, the more likely it is that reliance upon military power will provoke some nation to precipitate the very conflict which these armaments were designed to prevent. We are fearful lest there deepen in our country, a disposition to place primary reliance upon the preponderance of military strength; to subordinate the civil to the military in the formulation of policy; and to despair of the possibility of composing differences between the United States and the Soviet Union by means other than war. It would be a calamity if the people of other lands who, in times past, looked to our country for moral leadership, were to conclude that the United States had abandoned the search for peaceful alternatives to war.

"It is a matter of record in which we take pride that the United States, on many occasions, has declared its readiness to participate in arrangements that would bring the armaments of the nations under international control. To this record is now added the statement of President Truman (November 7, 1951) that once the burden of armaments is lifted 'new energies and resources would be liberated for greatly enlarged programs of reconstruction and development.' This is a goal toward which the National Council of Churches strives. We believe a peace offensive of the kind here envisaged would capture the imagination of the free peoples of the world, and would offer promise that conditions of poverty and social injustice upon which communism thrives, would be largely overcome." (From International Regulation and Reduction of Armaments, adopted November 28, 1951.)

11. NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, INC.

"STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

"Whereas the success of the United Nations depends upon the ability of each of the member states to transcend its own special interests: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the National Council of Jewish Women urge the United States Government to support efforts toward the transfer of sovereignty by member nations to the United Nations in those fields of activity where concerted international action can advance peace and welfare."

"INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ARMAMENTS

"Whereas the maintenance of strong armed forces by individual nations constitutes a potential threat to peace; and

"Whereas world peace can best be assured through the collective security system provided by the United Nations: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the National Council of Jewish Women urge the United Nations to continue to support (1) the establishment of armed force as provided in the United Nations Charter, (2) the regulation and reduction of conventional armaments, (3) the establishment of a system of effective international control and inspection of atomic energy and other weapons of mass destruction." (From resolutions adopted at the 19th triennial convention, 1949.)

12. NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION

"3. We favor the initiation by the United States of negotiations leading to the international abolition of conscription, and the reduction of armaments."

"5. Early establishment of international control of atomic energy and other modern scientific discoveries and technical developments to insure their use only for peaceful purposes." (Quoted from legislative program, 1950–51.)

13. THE PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT, INC.

"We believe that the security of our Nation can be achieved only by the elimination of war. Therefore, we urge that in the diligent pursuit of peace, the United States give full economic and political support to the United Nations. We urge adequate appropriations for the United States share in its projects such as aid to underdeveloped countries, assistance to war-devastated areas, care of displaced persons. We urge, moreover, that our national legislation should be integrated with our obligations to the United Nations and that the United States use the channels of the United Nations for its international activities in all possible ways.

"Because our special concern is with children and youth, we emphasize especially those United Nations agencies dealing with child welfare and education, such as the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Children's Emergency Fund, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

"We urge also that the United States continue its efforts to achieve through the United Nations universal disarmament, including conventional armaments as well as weapons of chemical, biological, and atomic warfare." (Adopted by the board of managers of the Parent-Teacher Association of Connecticut, Inc., January 1951.)

14. POSTWAR WORLD COUNCIL

"Yet although Western Europeans are reluctantly persuaded that rearmament is necessary, with reason they deplore its cost in terms of civilian austerities. Consciously or unconsciously the masses are aware from history that no arms race long continued ever resulted in peace.

"We have let the Communist devil have the good tunes of peace. We have been content to expose the hypocritical nature of the Stockholm peace petition and of that new and powerful Communist front called Partisans for Peace. President Truman, on October 24, 1950, did propose before the United Nations foolproof disarmament, but neither he nor any other ruler nor the Socialist and labor movement has excited the world as we ought about the reasonableness of enforcible and foolproof disarmament under a strengthened United Nations. If we had done that we should have greatly changed the present political and moral climate of much of Asia and Europe. We should have faced Stalin with the kind of world opinion which that realist would have to accept even if he should continue to boggle over the controls necessary to effective disarmament." (From a statement by Norman Thomas in the Post War World Council Bulletin, May 1951.)

15. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The proposals for disarmament adopted by the Sixth General Assembly of the United Nations at Paris in 1951, at the initiation of our Government, Great Britain, and France are a good beginning toward asserting our real objectives to all the world. We urge the United States Government to continue in

this course so that our true goal of building a structure for permanent peace may be realized" (approved report of the standing committee on social education and action of the 164th general assembly, New York City, May 28, 1952).

16. STATEMENT BY WALTER REUTHER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO

"The achievement of universal disarmament would bring the blessings of lasting peace to America in terms of intangible human values on which no price can be set. In addition, it would make possible for the American people to make substantial social progress in the form of higher living standards, greater security, increased social services, and a fuller, richer life in educational and cultural values.

"The achievement of universal disarmament would permit America to divert the billions of dollars now being spent for military requirements and national security to the task of meeting the unlimited peacetime needs of our people." (From a statement by Walter Reuther in A Total Peace Offensive, 1950.)

17. UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS

"In a lawless world, torn apart by war and threats of war, attention is diverted from the goal of a United Nations able to maintain peace by enforcing law. But to concentrate only on preparation for war and to set aside the hope of peace is to lose sight of the goal. Before the achievement of a United Nations comes the advocacy of it. In that advocacy, America has the opportunity to assume the moral leadership of the world, to seize the initiative from Communist imperialism and to join together in a unified front all nations truly seeking peace. The dynamic moral offensive is not only the essential first step to peace; it is also indispensable to defense against Communist aggression. The anounced determination to seek the necessary revision of the United Nations to give it power to prevent aggression will give a positive purpose and direction to American foreign policy. It will make our program for defense a means to the larger end of establishing for all nations protection under law.

"If the Soviet Union, faced with the suicidal consequences of a continued arms race, should accept this American offer and agree to join in creating a common structure of security under enforcible law, then the necessary changes in the United Nations will be achieved and the threat of armed aggression removed from the competition between differing ideologies and systems of government.

"To make the United Nations such a world organization, and to give it the power on which we and other nations can safely rely for our security; we propose that there be granted to the United Nations power (1) to prohibit by law the right of nations to use force or threat of force in international affairs; (2) to make laws binding on individuals and national governments prohibiting the construction or possession of armaments beyond that required for internal police purposes and thereafter to administer an agreed schedule for universal disarmament; (3) to maintain adequate and effective civilian inspection and police forces to assure that world law controlling national armaments is respected; (4) to maintain United Nations armed service sufficient to enforce world law prohibiting aggression and to support the United Nations civilian police where necessary; (5) to bring to trial in world courts any individual or groups who conspire to build weapons of war in violation of world law." (From the Policy of the United World Federalists, Inc., adopted June 1952.)

18. WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

"The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom has watched with deep concern the extension of militarism and rearmament throughout the world. The concept of the containment of communism by armed might has been implemented and expanded with each succeeding year.

"The league fully supports the action of the United Nations General Assembly in establishing the Disarmament Commission as a step in the direction of total world disarmament.

"To insure progress toward disarmament, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom recommends that our Government along with all member governments of the United Nation Disarmament Commission, recognize that only through compromise will an agreement be reached and a solution found. Such a compromise will necessitate a willingness of a government to modify its plans in the light of plans submitted by other governments.

"The league further recommends that our government be encouraged to take the initiative in calling for a world disarmament conference. Our major duty is to work with new energy and imagination for universal foolproof disarmament." (From 1952–53 Principles and Policies, United States section, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.)

19. YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

"We support the United Nations as a major instrument for cooperation among nations and urge our government to work through it as the primary channel for the conduct of international affairs.

"We support the strengthening of the United Nations for the realization of a world order based on common allegiance to international law and world government in which nations cannot resort to war for settlement of international disputes.

"We affirm the principle of the United Nations control of atomic energy and all weapons of mass destruction such as the atomic bomb, the hydrogen bomb, and bacteriological weapons." (From assembly actions, National Student YMCA, National Student Council, YMCA, at the fourth national assembly of the Student Christian Social Movement, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, 1951.)

20. YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

"As a Christian women's movement, the Young Women's Christian Association has revealed its social concern. Both within a nation of increasing power and a world hungry for peace and security we have a corporate responsibility to give continued support to the United Nations and its specialized agencies in its search for collective security; its attempts to bring about universal and effective reduction of armaments; its work for the promotion of human rights; its technical-assistance program and other programs for human welfare." (From the national public-affairs program adopted by the 19th national convention, Young Women's Christian Association of the United States of America, May 1952.)

(NOTE.—These resolutions and statements collected and compiled by the Committee for World Development and World Disarmament, Philadelphia, Pa.)

21. CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

"Our Government must continue to play a leading role in the development of a workable disarmament plan.

"The world must recognize that our goal is not war, but a sound structure for permanent peace. We must seek general disarmament, including international control of atomic energy with full powers of inspection" (from the program adopted at the 14th convention of the CIO in Atlantic City, 1952).

22. INTERNATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF FREE TRADE UNIONS

"We demand a universal system of atomic control with effective international inspection and widest possible application and use of atomic energy and science for the welfare of mankind and not for its destruction. We urge that all possible immediate steps be taken to carry out a progressive program of universal disarmament and the creation of a United Nations force to keep the peace. Social justice and understanding between peoples and nations alone can secure the peace of the world." (From the declaration on economic and social demands adopted at the ICFTU Congress held in 1951 in Milan, Italy.)

23. THE NATIONAL GRANGE

"Opportunity to promote a peaceful world is offered by membership in the United Nations. We should devote every effort to cooperate with other member nations in building the conditions of peace through the Economic and Social Council, while attempting to prevent actual aggression and war through action in the General Assembly and the Security Council.

"Not our official Government, but only we, the people of America, can cultivate that confidence, respect, and understanding among the peoples of the world which must be developed before we can achieve that condition of good will among men which will lead to peace on earth. Therefore, we set forth the following international policies and recommend—

"1. That the National Grange confer with other citizen organizations in an effort to determine whether it would be helpful to call an international citizens conference to discuss means of promoting a more favorable basis for peace through mutual understanding and cooperation.

* * * * * *

"3. That the United States use its influence to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations by promoting cooperation among its members in (a) exerting all possible influence to prevent conflict; (b) taking vigorous action to stop aggression; (c) establishing and maintaining the police force provided by the charter, (d) securing as soon as possible adequate and effective limitation and regulation of all armaments, through agreement enforced by complete inspection in all nations. * * * (i) striving to develop a world public opinion which will brand aggressive warfare as a crime against mankind." (From the legislative policies and programs, 1953.)

24. INDIANA PASTORS CONFERENCE

"Whereas history records the fact that armament races lead to war; and

"Whereas atom bombs, hydrogen bombs, bacteriological and other scientific weapons have made iminently possible the extermination of human and all other life on our planet; and

"Whereas we recognize that if the present armament race continues it will not only destroy our economy but also result in the destruction of mankind: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to use the offices of the United Nations and all other available channels to bring about universal disarmament adequately safeguarded with provisions for inspection." (From the 22d annual Indiana pastors conference, January 26–28, 1953.)

"The Seventh Plenary Assembly of the World Federation of United Nations Associations—

"Deeply concerned to lift from all peoples their fear of a third world war;

"Recalling that at its second and third plenary sessions the federation asked for the prohibition and suppression of atomic and bacteriological arms and of similar means of mass destruction, and at its fifth plenary session for a system of inspection and control of atomic energy to insure that it should be used for peaceful purposes only;

"Repeats its requests to all governments to reach a general agreement to prohibit the use of atomic, bacteriological, and all other arms of mass destructions, and at the same time to accept an effective system of control and inspection by which this prohibition can be assured;

"Welcomes the concessions made by the great powers which have now led to further negotiations in a new Disarmament Commission; and

"Expresses the deepest wishes of countless people in urging that these negotiations must be continued until success is achieved.

"The federation believes that the Disarmament Commission should also make proposals which will insure the limitation of all national armed forces and armaments to the minimum size necessary for the defense of the common peace, taking into account all relevant factors, and at the same time an effective system, within the scope of the Security Council, of international inspection and control of all armed forces and armaments and hopes that the five great powers will be the first to accept these proposals in order to show their will to peace to restore the confidence of all the world." (Adopted unanimously, seventh plenary assembly, Geneva, September 1–7, 1932.)

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES NATIONAL WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS, JUNE 23, 1952

The undersigned American Women's organizations welcome the establishment of the Disarmament Commission at the sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly. We wish the Disarmament Commission every success in its long and difficult task of developing comprehensive, coordinate plans, under international control, for the regulation, limitation, and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments, for the elimination of all major weapons adaptable to mass destruction, and for the effective international control of atomic energy to insure the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only.

Though it may take many years to achieve any substantial reductions in armaments, we commend this new, realistic approach to the disarmament problem, representing, as it does, a compelling desire for a radical limitation and reduction of all Armed Forces and armaments. We are heartened by the progress which is being made in the United Nations in the development of new methods of peaceful settlement of disputes and in the development of practical techniques for collective action against aggression. We consider that all these efforts will bring us nearer to the time when a comprehensive program for disarmament may be put into effect.

We recognize that armaments, necessary as they are until greater security against aggression has been achieved, will not of themselves bring about peace and stability. We are keenly aware that increasing emphasis should be placed on moral and spiritual values. We recognize the continuing need to alleviate the all-too-prevalent conditions of hunger, ill health, poverty, and illiteracy which are the breeding places of unrest and strife. In the belief that measures for economic and social betterment contribute to peace we commend the programs for equitable land reform and economic aid to underdeveloped areas.

One of the basic policies of all our organizations, which have long worked for peace, is support of the United Nations as a means of strengthening world peace and freedom. The combined membership of our organizations numbers more than 26,000,000; each woman has a share in the formation of her organization's policies. Each woman within her organization elects her leaders who serve for fixed terms. Each of our organizations develops its policies separately through democratic procedures, and, through cooperation, we have been able to advance our individual objectives.

We reaffirm our belief in the principles of the United Nations Charter, including the obligation of member nations to assist, by collective measures, victims of aggression and to refrain from aggression or assistance to aggressors.

We realize that a peaceful world cannot be built in a day, or a year. We are fully aware of the obstacles which lie in the path of international cooperation and of the need for patience, for understanding of the views of others and for unflagging efforts toward just and peaceful settlements. We are determined that these obstacles shall not discourage us but that they shall serve as a challenge to our faith in the principles of the United Nations.

Our organizations should increase our efforts to inform the American people about the constructive achievements of the United Nations, as we dedicate ourselves anew to the ceaseless endeavor to achieve peace with freedom.

American Association of University Women, Susan B. Riley, president, by Miss Helen D. Bragden, general director.

American Nurses Association, Elizabeth K. Porter, president, by Mrs. Frances C. Smith, United Nations program.

American Women's Association, by Elizabeth N. Corning, president.

General Department of United Church Women, Mrs. James D. Wyker, president, by Mrs. William B. Parsons, accredited observer.

Hadassah, by Miss Hannah L. Goldberg, national secretary.

League of Women Voters, Mrs. John G. Lee, president, by Mrs. Zelia Ruebhausen, accredited observer.

National Board, YWCA, Mrs. Edward W. Macy, president, by Mrs. Roland P. Beattie, vice president.

National Council of Catholic Women, Mrs. Gerald B. Bennett, president, by Mrs. Henry Barkhorn, accredited observer.

National Council of Jewish Women, Mrs. Irving M. Engel, president, by Mrs. Adolf Robison, accredited observer.

National Council of Women, Dr. Dorothy B. Ferebee, president, by Mrs. Eunice Carter, accredited observer.

National Council of Women in the U. S. A., by Mrs. Thomas G. Evans, president.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, by Judge Sara T. Hughes, president.

National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, Mrs. Abram V. Goodman, chairman, peace and world relations, by Mrs. Leonard Golluber, member, peace and world relations.

National Panhellenic Conference, Mrs. W. Harold Hutchinson, chairman, by Mrs. Darral B. Rasmussen, accredited observer.

National Women's Conference of the American Ethical Union, by Mrs. David H. Freudenthal, president; Mrs. Walter H. Weis, accredited observer.

United States Committee of the Pan Pacific Women's Association, by Mrs. Louise Laidlaw Backus, chairman.

Women's Division of Christian Service of the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church, Mrs. F. G. Brooks, president, by Mrs. Clifford A. Bender, associate secretary.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Elsie Picon, president, United States section, by Mrs. Gladys Walser, accredited observer.

Women's Trade Union League, by Sylvia Altman, executive secretary.

Women in World Affairs, Inc., board of directors, by Dorothy Kenyon, acting chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Before the Senator from Vermont yields the floor, the Chair, speaking as the junior Senator from New Jersey, wishes to commend the Senator for his leadership in offering this resolution.

The present occupant of the chair wishes also to associate himself with the remarks of the distinguished Senators who have spoken on the resolution. He is very happy to be one of the cosponsors. He feels it is an honor and a privilege to be a cosponsor of this splendid proposal.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is rare, indeed, that a Member of the Senate is commended by the Chair. In fact, I think it is almost unprecedented, and I am correspondingly grateful for the commendation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], which has been offered as a substitute for the committee amendment, on page 34 of the bill, from line 4 to line 24, inclusive.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Millikin
Barrett	Griswold	Monroney
Beall	Hayden	Morse
Bennett	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bridges	Hill	Pastore
Bush	Hoey	Payne
Butler, Md.	Holland	Potter
Byrd	Humphrey	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Flanders	Mansfield	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young
Gore	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as a

substitute for the committee amendment on page 34, lines 4 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand the Senator desires to have a yea and nay vote on his amendment. Inasmuch as we have had a quorum call, I suggest that he ask for the yeas and nays at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I explained yesterday, the purpose of the amendment is to provide the sum of $30 million, to meet up to 40 percent of the amount of money already provided by various municipalities throughout the United States in constructing or improving airports under the Federal Aid to Airports Act. As I further pointed out, of the 305 airports which would receive funds, 260 are now being used by the military.

It would be shortsighted policy, indeed, for the Congress not to appropriate this sum of money. Should we be unfortunate enough to find ourselves in another war—and I pray we shall not—or should the present emergency continue it may well be that our Government will be compelled to continue to expand the building of airport facilities. Here we have an opportunity to actually save money, by sharing the burden of constructing airports—available for military use—with local interests. We can kill two birds with one stone, so to speak.

In this instance, we are dealing with municipalities throughout the country which would put up $1 for each dollar we appropriate. Thus I submit, the Federal Government can share the construction burden, and actually do our Armed Forces and municipalities a world of good at the same time. In addition, Mr. President, the Congress has a contract to perform; we have a duty to the municipalities created by the 1946 Airport Act. It was found necessary in 1950 to extend the original act, the original 1946 act, so that the program which had been worked out by the CAA could be continued. The act, as amended, will not expire until 1958.

Thus in 1950 the Congress gave ample indication that it would continue to meet the obligations created under the terms of the 1946 act. We provided an incentive for municipalities to bond themselves and raise funds to be used for airport construction on terms provided by an act of Congress. The adoption of my amendment will make it possible for us to match 40 percent of the funds which have already been provided by the various municipalities. If we should do otherwise we shall certainly be breaking faith with the local sponsors. We will, in effect, be in the position of telling the municipalities to go ahead and create indebtedness, and then turning our backs on responsibilities we have indirectly helped to create. I maintain, Mr. President, that this is not good policy; it is neither fair nor honest. I realize the extent of our national debt; I am appalled by it, but airports are necessary and here the Congress has the opportunity of getting the same airport value for half the money, so to speak. Here we have an opportunity to build vital defense facilities and share the cost with the local sponsors. Otherwise, the Federal Government must put up the full amount. I leave it up to the Senate: Does not the Federal Government, paying one-half the cost of an airport, represent greater economy than our paying the entire cost? It is just a matter of mathematics and commonsense, Mr. President.

In addition we have an obligation to meet—a debt to pay, if you will. If this appropriation is not provided, we will have broken faith with the municipalities. In other words, certain municipalities of our country have sold bonds, or raised funds by other means, to the extent of $75 million, to build airports. The Congress would merely be providing funds to match 40 percent of that amount.

In justice to the municipalities which have issued bonds and are now paying interest on them, I believe we should meet them at least almost halfway. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as a substitute for the committee amendment on page 34, lines 4 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to state the committee's position on the amendment. The bill contains an appropriation for $22,700,000 to liquidate certain commitments. The Bureau of the Budget made no recommendation, and the House appropriated nothing for this item. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, after hearing all the evidence, felt the Government had certain ethical or moral commitments, if not legal commitments, in cases where communities, counties, or other political divisions, anticipating aid from the Federal Government, had gone forward in good faith, to the extent even of holding elections and voting bond issues. Therefore, it was felt we should meet situations in which the Federal Government had an obligation, in spite of the fact that the House and the Bureau of the Budget had taken no action.

After a great deal of discussion the committee arrived at the figure $12,500,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was not that figure arbitrarily arrived at?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; it was.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was it not shown that the municipalities in question had sold up to $75 million worth of bonds, and were ready to spend that amount of money if the Federal Government matched it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not recall the exact figures. I will say that a study committee is looking into the subject. The Department of Commerce has created a study committee for the purpose of going into the whole matter. Therefore we will have a more detailed consideration of the problem later. The amount recommended would take care of the emergency items, and the figure was arrived at on that basis. The Senator from Louisiana will remember that the subject was discussed in committee and that he took the position in the committee which he is now consistently taking on the floor.

The Senator from New Hampshire is presenting the majority opinion of the committee, which he believes suggests a fair solution of the problem.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. If the greater appropriation is made, it would not be spent, except in matching funds of the local communities? Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct, except that there is a difference of opinion as to the matching of the funds. I do not have in my hand the matching laws. However, funds are allocated to the States in accordance with a formula. For example, I hold in my hand the Illinois statute. In Quincy, Ill., at Baldwin Field, the sponsor is the city of Quincy. The Federal Government is asked to put up $30,000, and the sponsoring city is to put up $10,000. The total is $40,000. Therefore, the Federal Government is asked to match funds on a 3-for-1 ratio.

On the same page, I find listed from the same State other cities—for instance, Moline, Chicago, and Kankakee. In each case there is to be equal matching between the Federal Government and the sponsor. So apparently there is a variation in some cases, but we provide a definite formula for the States.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his courtesy and friendliness in this matter. I say to him that I am asking these questions in the most friendly manner because I know how he feels.

For instance, he has said he has before him figures in the case of Illinois. May I ask whether he also has available figures for Oklahoma?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think I have.

Mr. KERR. Can the Senator from New Hampshire tell me what Oklahoma's allocation would be in the case of the $12 million provided by the committee amendment, or, on the other hand, in the case of the $30 million which would be provided by the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot give the Senator from Oklahoma a breakdown of the figures. I hold in my hand the proposed 1954 Federal-aid airport program as recommended by the regional offices. It has never been approved by the Civil Aeronautics Authority in Washington or by the Department of Commerce or by the Bureau of the Budget or by the House of Representatives. What I have before me is simply the proposed program.

Among the requests for Oklahoma, as set forth in the tabulation I hold in my hand, is one for the Bartlesville Municipal Airport. The share of the Federal Government would be $78,580; the share of the sponsor would be $74,420.

In the case of the Duncan, Okla., municipal airport, the Federal contribution would be $98,611; the contribution of the sponsor would be $93,389.

In the case of the Enid, Okla., municipal airport, the Federal contribution is proposed to be $6,163, and the share of the sponsor is proposed to be $5,837.

In the case of the Holdenville municipal airport, the Federal Government's share is proposed to be $6,677, and the share of the sponsor is proposed to be $6,323.

In the case of the Lawton, Okla., municipal airport, the share of the Federal Government is proposed to be $6,934, and the share of the sponsor is proposed to be $6,566.

In the case of Will Rogers Field, at Oklahoma City, Okla., the share of the Federal Government is proposed to be $61,632, and the share of the sponsor is proposed to be $58,368.

I recall that is the airport about which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma particularly spoke to me; and he and others representing the State of Oklahoma appeared before the committee and discussed the matter there.

In the case of the Tulakes (Okla.) Airport, the share of the Federal Government is proposed to be $36,928, and the share of the sponsor is proposed to be $34,972.

In the case of the Tulsa municipal airport, the share of the Federal Government is proposed to be $48,106, and the share of the sponsor is proposed to be $45,558.

In the case of the West Woodward Airport, at Woodward, Okla., the share of the Federal Government is proposed to be $8,731, and the share of the sponsor is proposed to be $8,269.

Those are the requests which have been made in the case of Oklahoma; they are the ones the regional office which has Oklahoma under its jurisdiction has submitted to the top officials in Washington. That is as far as any official presentation or recommendation has gone.

Mr. KERR. Can the Senator from New Hampshire tell me, further, whether the project to which he has referred would be included under the $12,500,000 appropriation recommended by the committee, or can he tell me whether the larger appropriation, as proposed by the Senator from Louisiana, would be required for that purpose?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot completely answer the Senator from Oklahoma on that point, because whatever appropriation is made will be distributed among the States according to a formula, and then each State will play a part in the decision as to where the money will be spent within the State.

So a cooperative decision would have to be made, and the State of Oklahoma would play a part in reaching the decision as to the airports in Oklahoma to which the money would be applied.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The smaller the allocation for the entire State, the more difficult it will become to secure the cooperation. Has not the Senator from New Hampshire found that to be the case?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would say to the distinguished and able Senator from Oklahoma, who apparently knows his arithmetic very well, that, of course, that would be the situation.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I invite my colleagues to examine the hearings at page 1642. There it will be noted that the proposed 1954 Federal aid airport program, as recommended by the regional offices, sets forth where the money will be spent.

As I have pointed out, in the case of every project mentioned in the list, the municipalities already have sold their bonds and already have met the requirements necessary to conform to the act of 1946, as amended. It simply goes without saying that if we reduce the appropriation by more than half, the aid extended for airports will be much less than is indicated in the statement to which I have referred.

The Senator from Oklahoma has asked about Oklahoma airports. In response, the Senator from New Hampshire has mentioned the Bartlesville, Okla., municipal airport, and the airports at Duncan, Enid, Holdenville, Lawton, the Will Rogers Field at Oklahoma City, the Tulakes Field at Oklahoma City, and the airfields at Tulsa, Okla., and Woodward, Okla. The total Federal aid in this case would be $352,362—assuming that Congress appropriates the $30 million.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that if we appropriate only $12 million, some worthy municipalities will receive funds, but other municipalities just as worthy will be denied funds? In other words, the use of the appropriation for airports for certain municipalities will result in exhausting the fund for airports before other municipalities just as worthy will be able to receive any of the fund?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly. Not only that but even if we were to appropriate the $30 million, some worthy airports would still have to be omitted.

A while ago I pointed out that the municipalities already have provided $75 million to be used to match the funds of the Federal Government. By the amendment I propose to the committee amendment there will be appropriated only $30 million, or approximately 40 percent of the $75 million which the municipalities are prepared to contribute.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield again to permit me to ask another question of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. Then, if we confine this appropriation item to $12 million, there will be funds available for only 1 out of every 6 of the municipalities which are worthy of receiving funds, whereas if we appropriate $30 million, 40 percent of the municipalities that have provided for local participation funds will be able to have their funds matched by Federal funds. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to point out what I am sure every Member of the Senate must realize, and what we certainly must keep in mind as we consider the various appropriation bills, the one now pending being only the second regular appropriation bill to be considered by the Senate this year: We have a Federal debt of more than $265 billion; we have an unbalanced budget; and even with the reductions in appropriations which have been proposed, the budget will still remain unbalanced.

Proposals will be made for additional taxation.

Obviously, in the case of an airport list, such as the one to which reference has been made, or in the case of lists of other projects which no doubt will be before the Senate in connection with every appropriation bill, when we reduce the appropriation, each State and each area will receive less money. But how in the world shall we ever get the budget under control, and how in the world shall we ever prevent the terrific impact of continually unbalanced budgets, unless each Senator from each State is willing to have his State take a proportionate share of the cuts in appropriations, in connection with the total, overall budget?

Even with the proposed reductions, we shall not have a balanced budget.

I call to the attention of every Member of the Senate the fact that we are not now dealing with surplus funds, as we vote increased appropriations; but we are voting additional expenditures of money borrowed by the Federal Government. Certainly we must somewhere, somehow, reach an area of agreement looking toward a gradual balancing of the Federal budget. If we do not assume the responsibility of doing that, even this great Government of ours will take the same path other governments have taken, which has led to an absolutely disrupted currency, a bankrupt government, and collapse of the national economy. In every other area of the world where that has happened the countries have lost their free institutions.

So, certainly, let us recognize that in any appropriation we must exercise a wise moderation. I am not having particular reference to this appropriation. My State of California perhaps has as much interest in aviation and in airports as has any other State of the

Union, and obviously we, too, are going to have to bear our share of any reduction in the appropriation. If we do not assume that responsibility, we are then going to end up with a completely bankrupt Federal Government.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of replying to a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to page 1657 of the document to which he has just referred. At the bottom of that page he will find a reference to certain airports in the State of West Virginia. I ask the Senator from Louisiana whether, in each case, the funds are matched?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and I pointed that out. Those airports may be needed by the Nation. If the worst is to come, the Federal Government may have to spend the entire amount necessary for their construction. Under the amendment the Federal Government would have a chance to have the funds matched by the local communities.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will indulge me, I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether it is not true that flying over the areas of West Virginia in which the airports are located, as well as in the State of Pennsylvania, is considered to be extraordinarily hazardous, or has been so considered in the past; and that the airports are badly needed for the purpose of emergency landings? The items for West Virginia involve the sum of $375,000. Though I agree with what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has said, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that I believe California should be interested in airports, since many airplanes are made in that State. The flight of airplanes over certain of the mountainous regions has been extremely hazardous. Here we have a matter involving four airports, with but $375,000 standing in the way of the building of those airports, which will provide emergency landing fields.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will permit, I should like to say that, as I pointed out yesterday, some of these programs are so large that sufficient money could not be raised by the local authorities to complete the necessary work within 1 or 2 years. Some of it would have to be spread over a period of 5 years. In some cases, not only in West Virginia but in many other States, there are airports which are two-thirds completed, some of them 50 percent completed. Unless Congress appropriates the money, a great opportunity will be lost. Communities have sold their bonds in good faith in order to build airports.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me to address a question to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the development of aviation itself is no better and no worse than the development of the airport program, which, of course, goes with it?

Mr. ELLENDER. That, I think, is true.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that today, because of the development of jet engines and heavier aircraft, many airports are compelled to sidetrack much of their traffic, because they cannot now take care of the new developments?

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly so. As I pointed out yesterday, the major portion of the money will be used to extend facilities at existing airports, in order to meet the very situation which the distinguished Senator from Florida has described.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that about 55 of the airports about which we are talking share facilities with the military, and that, if it were not for the continued development of the airport program, the military would undoubtedly be asking the Congress for separate appropriations?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. As the Senator stated, 55 airports are now being shared with the military.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact, therefore, that if we continue this very worthwhile program, it will actually result in a saving, since, in that event, the military would be in no position to demand separate airports?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I pointed out.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I hope we may proceed expeditiously in the consideration of the pending bill. I should like to say but one or two things. In the case of the State of West Virginia, to which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia referred, the only items under consideration are four. None of them are strictly emergency fields. One is the Bluefield-Princeton Airport, where it is proposed to construct a permanent building.

Another is the airport at Clarksburg, where it is proposed to reconstruct the pavement. Another is the airport at Huntington, where it is proposed to construct new taxiways and to extend the apron, and to remove certain obstructions.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if I may reply to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I would say that the improvements which he has pointed out, with one exception, are absolutely essential to military use of those fields in case of emergency. The improvements planned at Huntington and at other airports are clearly necessary to the national defense. The amount involved is relatively pitifully small, in view of the fact that it would mean the completion of those airports for active use. In each case, the community is contributing half of the amount required.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in order to clarify the matter before the vote is taken, I should like to point out that at page 409 of the hearings on the pending bill, the following paragraph appears:

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR PROJECTS IN STATES

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS

SEC. 6. (a) As soon as possible after any appropriation is made under section 5 (b), 75 percent of the amount thereof available for grants for projects in the several States shall be apportioned by the Administrator among the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States.

In other words, there is a very definite formula under which the money is to be apportioned among the States; and the States provide the remainder of the necessary funds. I hope we may now vote on the pending amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it might be the course of prudence for me to remain quiet on the subject of the pending amendment, but I shall not do so. Throughout the country there are now a thousand airports which have been built with Federal aid, and there are about 4,600 more private airports. The Federal Government has already spent $200 million on these airports. I have gone over the list of approximately 350 projects and have made a rough tabulation. Approximately one-fourth of the money is to be spent for administrative buildings, for parking lots, for approaches, and so on, and not for the actual physical improvement of runways or the addition of new runways. At a time when it is said that the need for economy is so great that we must reduce the appropriation of Federal funds, it seems to me to be against public policy to spend money for additional airports, which are not needed.

I know that the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana, and indeed, the proposal of the committee, make a strong appeal.

Approximately 350 projects are listed. If the appropriations are made, there is always a chance that airports in one's own State will be included, and the more money appropriated, the greater the chance of allocations to one's own State. This is in danger of becoming a new pork barrel, and I submit that, in the interest of economy, we certainly should not adopt the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. I must say that, if that fails, I shall then move to strike from the bill the whole appropriation of $12.5 million.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana in the nature of a substitute for the provision proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment on page 34, lines 4 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the vote which is about to be taken on the Ellender amendment to the committee amendment, increasing the amount proposed in the committee amendment to $30 million?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana as a substitute for the committee amendment.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—19

Clements	Hayden	Malone
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Mansfield
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Ellender	Kefauver	Symington
Fulbright	Kerr	
Green	Kilgore	

NAYS—58

Aiken	Bricker	Byrd
Barrett	Bridges	Capehart
Beall	Bush	Carlson
Bennett	Butler, Md.	Case
Chavez	Jenner	Robertson
Cordon	Kennedy	Russell
Douglas	Knowland	Saltonstall
Duff	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
George	Martin	Sparkman
Gore	McClellan	Stennis
Griswold	Millikin	Thye
Hendrickson	Monroney	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Morse	Welker
Hill	Mundt	Wiley
Hoey	Pastore	Williams
Holland	Payne	Young
Humphrey	Potter	
Jackson	Purtell	

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson	Hennings	McCarthy
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Murray
Dirksen	Ives	Smith, N. C.
Flanders	Long	Taft
Frear	Magnuson	Tobey
Gillette	Maybank	
Goldwater	McCarran	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senate has done well in rejecting the proposal to spend $30 million on airports, but, in my judgment, it would be a mistake to spend even the $12,500,000 recommended by the committee. We should realize that the Secretary of Commerce, in the budget which he presented, requested no appropriations for airports, on the ground that the Eisenhower administration needed time to survey the entire airport program.

The House committee, and the House of Representatives itself, did not include any appropriation for additional airports, except the amounts required to liquidate outstanding obligations. This present item of $12½ million is a net addition by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The information in the hearings indicates that as of March 31, 1953, a carryover of nearly $11 million was available for new airports; so the Department is not entirely stripped of additional money. I think there is grave danger that we may fall for a flying pork-barrel in the form of airport appropriations. Therefore, I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 19, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,085,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 36, line 24, after the word "law", to strike out "$12,200,000" and insert "$12,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce," on page 37, line 14, after the word "reports"; to strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$2,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maritime Activities," on page 37, after line 23, to insert:

Ship construction: For payment of obligations incurred on or after July 1, 1953, for new ship construction in accordance with section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, $3,056,000; and in addition the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for such construction in an aggregate amount not to exceed $40,144,000.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I move that on page 37, line 25, after the word "construction" and before the word "in", there be inserted the words "and conversion."

Likewise, on page 38, line 3, after the word "construction" and before the word "in", I move that the words "and conversion" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 37, line 25, after the word "construction", it is proposed to insert the words "and conversion."

On page 38, line 3, after the word "construction", it is proposed to insert the words "and conversion."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand correctly that the adoption of this amendment, which would enable the Baltimore yards to get in on the gravy, would constitute approval of the committee amendment?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, although that is not a parliamentary inquiry, I shall be happy to answer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I eliminate the reference to the Baltimore yards.

Do I correctly understand that approval of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the committee amendment would carry with it approval of the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Illinois that that is a matter of construction, not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to appropriate $4,600,000 for the conversion of three dry-cargo ships to ore and oil carriers, under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. If the amendment is agreed to private capital to the extent of $4,800,000 will be added to the fund for the purpose of carrying on this work.

The nature of the project is to lengthen three dry-cargo vessels by 110 feet and to make ore and oil carriers out of them, so that each would be 632 feet in length and each would have a capacity of 20,200 tons.

The vessels are very badly needed to carry Labrador ore to the mills of the United States, and would therefore be of great aid in the defense effort, which is also very urgent now.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Who owns the ships?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The ships are presently owned by the American-Hawaiian Lines.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Are they privately owned?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. They are privately owned ships. This proposal comes under section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act. The Department of Commerce has passed on the application. The ships have been declared to be essential by the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration has approved application for subsidy. I think the item was originally included in the Department of Commerce budget, but was taken out by the Secretary of Commerce.

The ships are very much needed for the purpose of bringing Labrador ore to the mills of the United States. No such tonnage is available under American registry.

The ships are also essential from the standpoint of being standby oil tankers, which are very badly needed in our defense effort.

If these ships are not converted in American yards, the work will be done in Japanese yards. That will mean a loss to American labor of 1,000 workers for 1 year in American yards at a time when the industry is in a state of decline. It will also mean the loss to the industry of our skilled labor and technical personnel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator said that $4,800,000 would be added to the fund for the conversion of the ships. From what source will the money come to take care of the increased authorization?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I said that if the amendment were adopted, $4,800,000 in private funds would be added to the subsidy for the purpose of converting the vessels.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But where in the appropriation bill is money provided to pay the Government's portion that would automatically be available if the Senator's amendment were agreed to?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The money is in the general appropriation of some $43 million total. It is in the appropriation of $40,144,000 and $3,056,000, provided for in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I correctly understand that the $4 million authorization for the ships which the Senator is now asking is already in the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is already in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then if we reject the Senator's amendment, would the other figure automatically be reduced?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Will the Senator please state his question again?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator's amendment is not agreed to, will that mean that there will be $4½ million in the proposed $40 million which should not have been put there in the first place? Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; that is not correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What happens to the $4 million if the Senator's amendment is not agreed to? If the money is already in the bill to pay for the program which the Senator is now asking to be authorized, why was the money placed in the bill, if it did not serve a purpose?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, there are two ways in which the Government can assist private industry in building ships. Under section 501 the Government is the prime contractor, and carries the ships. They are gradually paid for on a construction subsidy basis.

Under section 504, which is the subject matter of this amendment, the ship company is the prime contractor, and the Government takes a mortgage on the ship, and on that basis puts in its construction subsidy. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, it amounts to this:

There is $3 million plus in the appropriation for this year, with permission to contract for not more than $40 million more over future years, as it is needed to be spent. If the words "and conversion," as suggested by the Senator from Maryland, are added, the language will permit the Maritime Commission to come in under section 504, with private industry as the prime contractor, for the amount of the construction subsidy which is authorized under the law for the Government to add. The Senator from Maryland states that private capital will put in $4 million. The construction subsidy today is on a 60–40-percent basis. Therefore private industry, as the prime contractor, puts in its $4 million plus, and the Government adds 40 percent of this amount this year and carries through until the program is completed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for that explanation, but I still repeat my question, which I do not think has been answered. On page 38, line 4, there is an item of $40,144,000 which is supposed to be for ship construction. Now if we add to the authorization for $4 million as conversion authority then where will that money come from unless you plan to increase the appropriation?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I know what the Senator's question is. The money was intended to be there, but the words "and conversion" were not added.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That gets back to the original point; namely, that there is $4 million in the proposed $43 million which should not have been there, unless the words "and conversion" were added. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me to answer that question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly that statement is not correct. There is nothing in the amendment except the Government's share. Ultimately the $40 million and the $3 million represent approximately 40 percent of the cost of the ships which may be constructed. The other 60 percent comes from private industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I still do not understand the answer, because the language in the bill would authorize $43,200,000 for ship construction. If there was justification before the committee for this amount for ship construction, how can we write in the words "and conversion," which would authorize the expenditure of $4 million more, and pay for it out of the same amount? The truth is that either today or later we will be asked to appropriate the additional money; you cannot authorize an expenditure of four million without paying for it. Either we shall be short after we get through, or we have too much to start with.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. We can take it or leave it on that basis. I am talking about the essential nature of the program. I am speaking on the basis of what is right and proper in connection with an arm of defense of this great nation. We have no standby tanker capacity. We are about to open up vast mines in Labrador. We have no ships of American registry to bring the ore into American mills.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to say also to the Senator that if these ships were moved from America and taken to Japan, to remain there for a year in that danger spot in Asia, to save the small sum of $4,600,000, it would be most reprehensible.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My understanding of this amendment is that by adding the words "and conversion" we make the language refer to construction or conversion.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Construction or conversion of ships under section 504, with the shipowner as the prime contractor up to the amount of money which is allowed in the amendment. The ships to be constructed may be tankers; they may be passenger ships; they may be cargo ships; or any other kind of ship for which the Maritime Commission believes it is wise to spend the money.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am very happy the Senator from Maryland is so concerned over

the defenses of the United States. I infer that the people of Baltimore are also concerned with having a strong defense for the United States. I also am concerned. If it is so necessary to convert tankers into ore carriers to bring Labrador ore to the steel mills at Baltimore——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Let me correct the Senator——

Mr. AIKEN. If that is necessary, why are the so-called vested interests in Baltimore doing everything within their power to prevent ore carriers constructed by companies which are willing to construct them at their own expense from carrying some of the same ore to the great steel industry of the Midwest?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator's facts are just as faulty as his argument. In the first place, these are dry-cargo ships. We propose to convert them into ore carriers and oil carriers. We need both very badly.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood the Senator to say they would be used as ore carriers, to carry ore from Labrador. I do not know what oil is produced in Labrador. Are there oil wells in Labrador?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There may not be any oil wells in Labrador, but oil tankers are very badly needed by this country for its defense.

Mr. AIKEN. In Labrador?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The ships would be used to carry ore from Labrador when the channel was open. When the channel was not open, and they could not be used for that purpose, they would be used to carry oil from all parts of the world.

Mr. AIKEN. My question is, Why are the interests in Baltimore so determined that the steel mills of the great Central West, which is the great steel center of the United States today, shall not be permitted to get ore from Labrador in ships which they are willing to construct at their own expense? Not only do the interests in Baltimore want to prevent the Midwest from getting Labrador ore, but they want the contributions of the taxpayers to build ships for them.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Let me answer that question. We have a program under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to keep our merchant marine strong. We grant subsidies for that purpose. We do not do it for the purpose of making money for private enterprise. We do it for the purpose of having on hand when we need them tankers, ore carriers, and troopers. Yesterday the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] referred to certain liners for which he said we can wait another year. These are not passenger ships. They are troopers. We need them in time of war to transport our troops to all parts of the world in time to do good. A delay of 1 year may mean a great deal to the security of the country. If we are to follow the policy which I have described, why criticize those who are taking advantage of the act which is on the books?

Mr. AIKEN. "Taking advantage" is right.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If the law is not right, take it off the books.

Mr. AIKEN. My question is, Why should the taxpayers of the United States build four ships to present to Moore-McCormack and Grace Lines when other lines, because of good management, are able to operate under their own power and initiative? Why should we impose on the taxpayers and continually give those two companies ships which admittedly are good for only 20 years? For the cost of five of these ships we could build the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, which would be far more valuable to the United States as a whole.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. And which would not carry one single soldier or 1 ton of military cargo in time of emergency or war.

Mr. AIKEN. It would produce more steel than by what the Senator proposes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Can the Senator from Maryland tell us how many individuals would be the beneficiaries of the $3,056,000 provided by the bill to take care of obligations incurred on and after July 1, 1953, for new ship construction, in accordance with section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; how many individuals or identitles would be the beneficiaries under the provision for $40 million, for contracts for such construction in the future; and how many individuals would be added as beneficiaries under the amendment suggested by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The view I take of the situation is that 160 million people would be benefited. All the American people would be directly benefited.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from Maryland tell the Senate through how many identities the 160 million people would be benefited?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Oklahoma must have all that information available.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma is reading the bill and referring to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Maryland says exactly what he means, namely, that the amendment would provide something of great advantage, not only to the shipbuilding industry and the ship-repair industry, but to the standby capacity of our Nation for national defense.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a further question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. KERR. If the money is appropriated, it will be paid directly to some identity or identities; will it not?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Can the Senator from Maryland tell the Senator from Oklahoma how many such identities there are to whom this money would be actually paid?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Maryland will tell the Senator from Oklahoma that he does not know, and that the Senator from Maryland is not interested in personalities. The Senator from Maryland is interested in doing what he believes to be right, and he is standing on the floor doing just that.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator from Maryland give the Senate his estimate of how many identities or individuals would be the direct recipients of the appropriation?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I will ask the Senator from Oklahoma to tell us how many people are going to be direct recipients of any appropriation made by the Senate.

Mr. KERR. We are not voting on "any" appropriation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Oh, yes; we are voting on a great many appropriations.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, can the Senator from Maryland answer my question?

Mr. POTTER and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Oklahoma, as to who would receive the benefit from the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland, I may say that the employees——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I raise a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The point of personal privilege is out of order. The Senator from Michigan will proceed.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I will state that the employees of four shipyards of the United States would be the beneficiaries of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland. This is the situation——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

Mr. KERR. A point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland does not have to yield for a point of order. The Senator from Maryland has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Michigan for a question.

Mr. KERR. A point of order, Mr. President. If the Senator from Maryland has yielded the floor to the Senator from Michigan——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Maryland has not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from Maryland has not yielded the floor. The Senator from Maryland has yielded for a question to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KERR. Then the Senator from Oklahoma makes the point of order that the Senator from Michigan is not asking a question, but making a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan will state the question.

Mr. POTTER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know that we have on the statute books a provision which allows certain ship operators or any citizen of the United States, for that matter, to apply for a construction subsidy? Congress has acted on that provision.

For example, let us take the American-Hawaiian Line, which has applied and has been granted authority by the Maritime Administration to convert 3 or 4 vessels into ore carriers for a specific trade. The Maritime Administration has granted the authority. The Administration has held that the line meets the qualifications set forth in the statute. The Eisenhower administration has not asked for the funds. I say that we should either repeal the law or, if the line qualifies, it should receive the funds.

The Senator from Oklahoma must know that if these ships are not converted in American yards they will be converted in Japanese yards. These are military-type vessels, which would be sent to Japan for conversion. They would be sent into a dangerous area of the world, and perhaps they would be harbored there for a year's time. During that time anything could happen. We could lose the ships. At the same time, Mr. President, thousands of American workmen in our shipyards would be denied work which should go to them. I say if we are going to maintain the fourth arm of our national defense we must provide for an adequate merchant marine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield now to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, has the Senator from Michigan concluded?

Mr. POTTER. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say, in reply to my friend from Oklahoma, that I have an answer to his question. Specifically I agree with what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has just stated. We have today, instead of 1,500,000 men employed in 100 active shipyards, as we had during World War II, only 8 shipyards building for oceangoing service, employing no more than 100,000 persons.

At the present time there is not a shipyard in the United States which will have any work at all in any of its yards after February 1955. The purpose of the amendment with respect to construction and conversion is to permit the Maritime Administration, in its discretion, to decide, under section 504, which is the section that permits prime contracts to be held in the industry, with a mortgage taken by the Government, and a construction subsidy allowed, what type of ships can best be built with the amount of money appropriated and carried over for the next 3 or 4 years.

As I said, in the Fore River yards in Massachusetts, there will be no work after February 1955. In the Bethlehem yard at San Francisco there will be nothing after February 1955. In the New York Shipbuilding Co.'s yards there will be nothing after May 1954. In the Bethlehem yards at Sparrows Point, Md., there will be no work after November 1954. In the Ingalls shipbuilding yards, which I believe are in Birmingham, Ala., there will be no work after March 1954. In the Todd Shipyards at Houston, Tex., there is nothing at the present time. In the Newport News yards there will be nothing after December 1954. In the Sun Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. there will be nothing after April 1954.

If the shipyards are to be kept alive, if the trained and skilled ship-construction workers are to remain available, and if the naval architects who know how to design good ships are also to remain available, the Government should take some interest in this matter.

This subject has been discussed by me with persons who have come to my office from Alabama, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Virginia. I have also had telephone conversations on this subject with persons in Virginia.

A few private ships may be ordered without having a Government construction subsidy available.

The proposal we make will not give the Maritime Administration specific authority to provide for the spending of the sum of money appropriated. But, if the money can be advantageously spent; if the private shipowners are able to meet the requirement, under the Merchant Marine Act, to maintain a certain reserve, and if the Maritime Administration then decides, under the terms of the act, that the ship proposed for construction would be advantageous to the Government, in time of war, or in time of need during peace—for instance, at a time such as the present—then it will be possible for the Maritime Administration to enter into contracts with the shipping concerns.

I have favored this proposal, as has the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], because we wish to do what we can to keep the shipyards alive, so that in time of need, whether in peace or in war, there will be in the United States a foundation upon which the shipbuilding industry will be able to expand.

Does what I have said answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield further, to permit me to ask another question of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am glad to yield for that purpose, if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. KERR. I have asked only a simple question; I have not attempted to embarrass any Senator. My purpose has been to obtain information.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have tried to provide the information desired.

Mr. KERR. Then I must assure my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, that evidently he did not understand my question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Oklahoma please repeat his question?

Mr. KERR. I ask how many identities—either individual or corporate—would receive direct payments of Federal funds if the amendment to the committee amendment becomes a part of the law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Not one person or corporation would receive a penny until the Maritime Administration determined that the requirements had been complied with and it approved a contract.

Mr. KERR. The money is to be paid, is it not? Will the Senator from Massachusetts state whether the money will eventually be paid by the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The construction subsidy will be paid eventually to the shipping company whose contract is approved by the Maritime Administration and whose contract is accepted on the basis of a bid; in the case of the shipyard that is the lowest bidder.

Mr. KERR. Can the Senator from Massachusetts tell me how many such identities there will be, to whom the funds will be paid?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The funds ultimately will be paid to the firm approved by the Maritime Administration, which has funds of its own to be used in accordance with the provisions of the Maritime Act. Such a firm might be the Moore-McCormack Lines or the Grace Line, in the case of a passenger ship; or in the case of an oil tanker, it might be some other line. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] may know the names of such lines; I do not know them. It might be one of the large oil companies that are building new oil tankers. It might be any company which could put up 60 percent or could show that it had in reserve 60 percent, in order to pay its share.

Then, if the Maritime Administration was convinced that the firm was able to meet the requirements, payment of the money would be approved by the Maritime Administration. That is my understanding of the arrangement.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield again, to permit me to ask a further question?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL obtained the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me now?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from Massachusetts think that 10, 15, or 20 companies, or more, or less, might participate in the program?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I must guess. I assume that the companies which might participate, and which would have reserves sufficient to enable them to build sizable ships, would probably be not more than 10, and probably less.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for the information.

Then the money would be a Federal subsidy paid to the companies which eventually would become the owners of the ships, for the construction of which the companies would pay a certain percentage and the Federal Government would pay a certain percentage. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 sets forth a fundamental provision for a strong merchant marine, namely, that the construction for which a subsidy is paid must be "necessary for the national defense and for the development of our national and domestic commerce."

That would be the basis upon which the Maritime Administration would arrange for such contracts.

Mr. KERR. I understand that the Federal Government would pay this

much either in the case of the conversion of ships now owned by these companies or in the case of the construction of ships by them. After the ships were either converted or constructed, with the assistance from the Federal Government, they would belong 100 percent to the private owners, would they not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under section 504, the ship, if built under that section, subject to the provisions of the amendment, would become the property of the private owner; but there would always be a mortgage held by the Government, and the Government could take over the ship if the company did not live up to the terms of the Merchant Marine Act.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield further to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Massachusetts said there would be provision for the Federal Government to have a mortgage. Does that mean the Federal Government would have a right to take over the ship by paying for it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that if the ship company did not live up to the terms of the contract, the Federal Government would hold the mortgage and could take over the ship.

Let me state that I assume the Senator from Oklahoma understands the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act. Under that act there are two kinds of subsidies. One of them is a construction subsidy; the other is an operating subsidy. The purpose of the construction subsidy is to permit ships to be built in the United States. Such a subsidy is necessary because of the higher cost of living and the higher cost of construction in the United States. The operating subsidy permits United States shipping companies to operate the ships.

Under the law an operating subsidy may be paid, for the reason that in the United States wage costs and maintenance costs are greater than in the case of other countries. Operating subsidies are determined by comparing the costs in other countries where ships are built or operated—such countries as England or Belgium, and so forth—with the costs in the United States. The subsidy the Federal Government pays is based on the difference.

The operating subsidy is very similar to the price supports in the case of agriculture.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The Secretary of Agriculture has said he is going to cleanse and purify the American farmer from the taint that attaches to him by reason of the Federal Government's cooperation and support.

Will the Senator from Massachusetts explain to me how it is that the Federal Government's program of support in the case of agriculture is something that taints and corrupts the farmer, when 7 million farm families are participating in a program which costs approximately $60 million a year, whereas the $40 million for the construction and conversion subsidy and the $40 million to $50 million for the operations subsidy for less than 15 shipping companies remove from them the possibility that they also may be tainted just a little?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I prefer not to engage in a debate on agricultural matters with the Senator from Oklahoma, this afternoon. I have never indulged in personalities. The word "taint" involves personalities in my judgment.

Inasmuch as Oklahoma is an agricultural State and inasmuch as many of the people of Massachusetts still go down to the sea in ships, let both of us believe it will be possible for the industries of our States to perform their proper functions.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may observe, first, that there is a difference between subsidizing 6 million farm families, or subsidizing them potentially, and subsidizing two shipping companies. The report of the committee clearly indicates that it is expected that the subsidy will be used for the purpose of constructing 2 ships for the Grace Line and 2 for the Moore-McCormack Co. I read from the report:

> The Government construction-differential subsidy for each ship is $13,600,000.

That means a total of $27,200,000. The Government's share on each of the 2 Grace Line ships would be $8 million, a total of $16 million. If, of the $43,200,000, $27,200,000 is given to the Moore-McCormack Co., and $16 million to the Grace Line, how much will that leave for all other shipping lines of the United States, and particularly the 8 to which the Senator has referred as possibly being eligible under this provision? In view of the report of the committee, will not the Maritime Commission be obligated, once it gets this money, to spend it in the building of 2 ships for the Grace Line and 2 for the Moore-McCormack Lines?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad indeed that the Senator from Vermont has asked that question. I answer it by saying that the Truman budget called for $118 million for ship-construction subsidies. The Eisenhower budget eliminated the entire item. The House omitted it. The amendment would restore $3 million and permit the spending of $40 million more over the period of the next few years.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that to be done by the President?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. Now, let me come to the Senator's question. The $118 million in the Truman budget was based on the construction of 4 passenger ships, 2 by the Moore-McCormack Lines, 2 by the Grace Line, and 1 prototype oil tanker. The program, as it was presented to the Appropriations Committee and agreed to, called for 4 passenger ships, omitting the prototype oil tanker. Both Senators from Maryland brought up the question of conversion in addition to construction. As one of the original sponsors of the committee amendment, I did not wish to increase the amount of the appropriation, so I agreed to the construction or conversion, with the thought that the Maritime Administration might decide what type of ship it wanted, and whether to convert ships or to build new ones, within the amount appropriated.

Mr. AIKEN. But in view of the fact that $43,200,000 would be available, $27,200,000 is promised to the Moore-McCormack Lines. Is not that true?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; it is not promised to anyone.

Mr. AIKEN. From a reading of the committee report, I would think that after the appropriation is made the money is clearly promised to the Moore-McCormack Lines and the Grace Line.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that it is my understanding that not one penny of the amount mentioned will necessarily be appropriated, unless the conditions laid down in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 are complied with. Certain contracts would first have to be worked out. They must be backed up by certain reserves that can be used in the event the Government enters into the contract. By making this appropriation, we do not commit the Government to the expenditure of the money. It merely makes it possible for the Maritime Administration to spend it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator think for 1 minute that the Maritime Administration, as the successor to the Maritime Commission, will not place contracts with Bethlehem Steel and other large corporations that would profit from them, or will insist upon that being done? Does the Senator know of any instance in which the Maritime Administration has stood up against such influences?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot specifically say as to that, but I do know that all the ship-construction funds have not been used in the past. This is a mere appropriation.

Mr. AIKEN. In fact, it is a subsidy to the two companies named, is it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should not so look upon it, but it is appropriated in order that people employed in shipyards might maintain a degree of skill. As a result of keeping our shipyards going, ships that might be needed could be built. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the four passenger ships, if built, would take the place of five ships that are now overage. The safety regulations of the Coast Guard are waived in the case of government-owned ships which are now operated as passenger ships.

Mr. AIKEN. If we are to apply measures of this sort to the shipyards, at a time when the economy of the country and the income of the country are at an all-time high, are we not merely inviting trouble if the time arrives when there may actually be unemployment in the country?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not consider the amendment as intended to afford relief. If there is a desire to repeal the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to have no shipyards, no ship construction, and no new ships to be operated

under the American flag, that is a question for the Congress to decide. Two or three years ago, we amended and improved, to a certain extent, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The fundamental principles of that act have remained in force. We may as well admit, and I should be less than frank if I did not admit, that American shipyards cannot compete in costs with those of Japan or England. The problem we must face is whether we desire to have any American shipyards, and whether we want the American flag flying off the stern of any merchant vessel or passenger ship. If we do, then we must continue the subsidies; we must continue the aids. If we do not desire those things—and there are those who feel that we should not have a shipbuilding industry—then we can repeal the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Mr. AIKEN. How many shipyards could be subsidized by the building of four ships at a cost of $43,200,000?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There are today eight shipyards in the United States which are building oceangoing vessels. As I said to the Baltimoreans who came to see me, this involves competitive bidding. The Senator from Vermont is very familiar with farming expressions and similes. As I said to those interested in shipping who came from Baltimore to see me, in the event the pending bill becomes law, with the pending amendment embodied in it, if they have ever been in a chicken yard and picked up a fistful of corn, scattered by the farmer for a flock of chickens, they will understand what will happen in this matter.

Mr. AIKEN. I may add, there is an advantage in it, if the private ship companies shut down, for when prices go down, the Government can rebuild the shipyards.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Many workers would be thrown out of employment.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; but the Senator has just been reading the figures, and saying that the appropriation is to take care of orders until 1954.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. I referred to the ships which are being constructed at the present time. I do not want to make an erroneous statement, but, to the best of my knowledge, the naval architects, the drawing-board experts, and all others who are engaged in shipyard activities, are fast completing all the work that is available, if they have not already done so.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understood the Senator, he said that the work on most of the ships would be completed by November 1954.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That means that the last rivet will have been driven.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator think it good policy, and that it contributes to the strengthening of our econmy and the security of the Nation, to have a great industrial establishment so dependent upon Government orders that, if it does not receive orders running for years into the future, it will be something to worry about?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My answer to that question is, yes, if we want any ships flying the American flag. I have stated already that some persons think we should rely on England, or on Japan, or on Belgium, or on Norway and Sweden and other shipping countries for all our shipping. But I would say to my distinguished colleague that we have enacted a law, year after year, on the subject of mutual security, providing that 50 percent of everything granted by way of mutual security shall be shipped in American bottoms. We cannot have American bottoms unless we have operating subsidies. We cannot have them unless we have some form of construction subsidies.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that the requirement that 50 percent of the work shall be done in American yards is itself a subsidy to American shipyards and American shipping?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It makes it possible for American citizens who are the officers and men on the ships to be paid the wages we believe are proper in the United States. Furthermore, we have recently completed in Japan a certain number of cargo-carrying and troop-carrying ships for use by the Army in time of war. Do we want all our troops to be carried by foreign-built vessels unless they are completely owned by the Government?

Mr. AIKEN. It is possible for the merchant marine to fly the American flag on ships which perhaps are built in foreign yards. Possibly the best ship operators out of the port of Boston are having ships built in foreign countries. As I understand, they can get them built better and for less than half the cost of those constructed in the United States. They can get them built in accordance with their own specifications, and they do not come under Government domination and control forever afterward.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know the Senator from Vermont is a very patriotic citizen. Supposing Japan were overrun, or supposing an atomic bomb were dropped on England, and we should become involved. If there were no yards in the United States we would be in a most unfortunate position.

Mr. AIKEN. As I remember, we constructed a great many ships in a very short time when war came.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Referring to the immediate question of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland, may I ask if it is not a fact that yards on the Atlantic coast which are regarded as most adapted for conversion purposes are the Baltimore yards of the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp., otherwise known as the Sparrows Point yards?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. They are not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of my own knowledge, I do not know the answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. is owned by the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corp.?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does it still have the Alameda, Calif., yard?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That I cannot answer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are there still shipyards at Alameda, Calif.?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question. There are private shipyards on the Pacific coast, and there are navy yards on the Pacific coast.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator read a list a while ago, and I was wondering if the Alameda plant was still in production?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is a Bethlehem yard at San Francisco.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, Bethlehem has 3 shipbuilding yards, 1 at Fore River, Mass., 1 at Baltimore, Md., and 1 in San Francisco Bay, which used to be the old Alameda yard.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is there not one at Kearny, N. J.?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is a yard in New Jersey, and a yard in Virginia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All owned by the Bethlehem Co.?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator two further questions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My first question is this: If the amendment of the Senator from Maryland is agreed to, obligating us to the conversion of cargo ships into tankers, could the ultimate expenditures be held down within the total of $43,200,000?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, because none of the money needs to be obligated unless the Maritime Administration signs contracts for the Government's share. Naturally, it will not sign a contract for more money than it has.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the construction of the four ships is authorized, and the conversion of cargo ships is also authorized, and they are all started, and if it costs $43,200,000 as the Government's share of the subsidy for the four passenger and cargo ships, will there not have to be a later appropriation for the conversion of cargo ships into tankers?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer to that question is that there will not have to be, because the Maritime Administration will not commit itself if the funds are not available.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But there could be great pressure upon the Maritime Administration to request and upon this body to grant further appropriations to provide for these conversions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I do not think so. The construction subsidies will run along from year to year, or not from year to year, as the Congress shall determine. Certainly, if the Maritime Administration should authorize a greater amount than that appropriated by Congress, it would be subject to very severe penalties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the two ships of the Grace Line, which are said to be over age, are over age only by 6 months, namely, that they are 20 years and 6 months old?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that all five of the passenger ships now operated by the Grace Line and by the Moore-McCormack Lines are over age.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I read the testimony, and, subject to correction by members of the staff, it is my understanding——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would take the Senator's word for that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator to consult his staff with reference to that question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The ships became 20 years of age during the past calendar year. The Coast Guard has urged that something be done. These ships are still owned by the Government. They were not built under section 504. Therefore, the Government is operating passenger ships at a time when its own regulations for privately owned ships are not being lived up to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the Senator now referring to the two ships of the Moore-McCormack Lines rather than to the two ships of the Grace Line?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that it refers to all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do these ships become obsolete and senile because they are slightly over 20 years of age?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Looking at my colleague from Illinois I know he is not senile, but the life of a ship runs out before that of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the Senator's answer, but is it not true that when the Administrator, Mr. Gatov, was asked whether construction was urgent, he replied, at page 407 of the House hearings, that it was not urgent?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator says so, I would say that that is the statement the Administrator made.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have just consulted, within the past 5 minutes, the House hearings, and it was the statement of the Administrator that the construction of new ships and the retirement of the four old ships were not urgent. The Administrator was asked this question in the hearings:

Mr. COUDERT. So, as a matter of fact, there is no great urgency to undertake commitments for construction of these four ships at this time?

The Administrator replied:

I would not say so, on the urgency basis; no, sir.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not dispute that statement. Let me answer the statement of the Senator from Illinois in this way:

In 1947 the President's Advisory Committee on Merchant Marine recommended the construction of 46 pasenger ships over the 4-year period from 1948 to 1951. Since then, only three new ships have been constructed—3 out of 46. None is now under construction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the two ships of the Grace Line which are 6 months over 20 years of age are the *Santa Rosa* and, I believe, the *Santa Maria?*

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that those ships were reconverted at Government expense, and at enormous cost, only 6 years ago?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question of my own knowledge.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Government paid the cost of reconversion of those ships?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On the basis of what the Senator has said, I assume that they were used as troop-carrying ships, as I know some others were, and were then converted to passenger ships.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that they were converted at Government expense about 6 years ago?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Simply because the Government had destroyed their value as passenger ships in order to transport American troops during the war.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, after only 6 years of use as passenger ships, they are to be scrapped, and new ships are to be constructed at a cost to the Government of approximately $16 million. Is not that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is because their age limit has run out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Only by 6 months. Are we going to say that when a ship passes by 1 day the 20-year point, it must be scrapped?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall not engage in a debate with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, over whether or not the Coast Guard regulations are proper regulations to insure the safety of our citizens. It is my understanding that the Coast Guard has stated that they are waiving, after 20 years, the safety regulations required of private ships which had been owned by the Government.

I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact that in the past all the ships have been built under section 501. If this amendment is agreed to, it will be the first time any ships will be built under section 504 in which private concerns are the prime contractors. This is an experiment.

Personally, I recommended this language because it was my desire to keep the Government subsidy as low as possible, and I wished to make certain that if private companies did not have funds to go into this project, no money would be spent. The companies concerned are now supposed to have in their possession sufficient reserves to enable them to proceed to contract.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Massachusetts be interested in hearing the testimony of Administrator Gatov, of the Maritime Administration, which appears on page 406 of the House hearings?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should be glad to hear anything the Senator thinks is pertinent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Gatov, speaking of the Moore-McCormack Lines ships, said:

Those particular ships are beyond the age, I think, where they can be economically operated. They were built in 1928, and their birth date is beginning to show. There is no reason why you cannot defer it. I would be less than honest if I said we had to go all-out and build those new ships. There is a certain amount of usefulness left in the existing vessels—I cannot deny that—but again the act is our guiding principle. Vessels over 20 years of age can be subsidized only if it can be shown that it is in the public interest to do so. It is one of our fundamental principles.

Mr. COUDERT. Would you have to stop paying subsidies on those ships operated for 21 years?

Mr. GATOV. Yes, sir; the law specifies it.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the law say anything about 20 years?

Mr. GATOV. Yes, sir. The law says a vessel over 20 years of age is not eligible for a subsidy unless it can be shown to be in the public interest to subsidize them.

Mr. COUDERT. I am asking you if the Maritime Board will stop the operation of those ships when they pass their 20th birthday?

Mr. GATOV. They have already passed it.

Mr. COUDERT. And are still being subsidized?

Mr. GATOV. Yes, sir.

In other words, these vessels can continue in operation, and, in the case of the Moore-McCormack Lines, have continued for 4 years beyond the 20-year period, and are still being subsidized under the operating differential. I think on the same principle the two Grace Line ships, the cost of which the Government has already paid, can be continued in operation. But no, we are asked to scrap them all and pour $43 million of public funds into these companies, and into the four shipyards which will build the ships.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say again to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, what I have repeated over and over again, that the Coast Guard regulations are being waived, and when that is done there is some doubt about the safety of the passengers on those ships. The Coast Guard does not like that practice. The Coast Guard, in 1 day, if my information is correct, could take those ships out of operation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Will the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the committee amendment result in some saving by providing for conversion rather than new construction?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In my opinion, it is a proper amendment, because it would give the Maritime Administration more latitude in choosing the ships which it is most necessary to build under a construction subsidy within the amount of the appropriation. It is a perfectly proper amendment.

Mr. CASE. My thought was that if conversion would save some money over the cost of new construction, would it not be also in order to reduce the amount of the construction authorization proposed by the committee amendment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is a perfectly proper question. I would hope that the amount would not be reduced, because I do not know what the effect of reducing it would be. I understand three ships will be eligible for conversion if the amendment shall be agreed to.

I call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that there are some new ships being built for American companies today in England and Japan. As the Senator from Maryland has said, the conversions would go

to Japanese yards if the work were not done in the United States.

Mr. CASE. Could the Senator give assurance that if the amendment remained in the bill when it went to conference, and it should develop that the addition of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland would permit a reduction in the total amount of contract authorizations proposed, the Senator from Massachusetts would assent to such a reduction in conference?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not oppose any reasonable amendment. I say that because I am interested not so much in the question whether these ships are economical, or are safe or unsafe, but my desire is that some of our shipyards be kept open and that some employees having a knowledge of naval architecture and naval construction be retained, so that in the event we should become involved in another war, we would not have to depend entirely on England, Norway, Sweden, or Japan. That is the fundamental principle on which I am working.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the Coast Guard regulations are followed on an automatic basis of age, and not after inspection and a finding that ship X or Y is in fact unsafe? If the Coast Guard finds that a ship has reached the age limit, its recommendation is automatic, is it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer the Senator's question from my own knowledge. I should suppose that that would be a matter of prima facie evidence, and that the Coast Guard would have to be shown that it was safe to operate the ship.

In that connection, I may say to the Senator from Oregon that it has been pointed out to me by an assistant from the Committee on Appropriations that it appears in the justification furnished with the Truman budget, under present requirements the Moore-McCormack ships are not completely fireproof.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Massachusetts realize that as the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, these ships were converted and reconditioned in very recent years, and placed in a condition suitable for the transportation of troops?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Again I cannot speak of my own knowledge. I assume that the ships were converted for war use and then reconverted for passenger use; but I do not know that as a fact.

Mr. MORSE. When they were reconverted for passenger use, were they not subject to Coast Guard inspection? Or does the Senator wish to argue that the Coast Guard allowed to go to sea, after conversion to passenger use, ships that were unsafe for the carrying of passengers?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would agree with the implication the Senator from Oregon has made.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that we have on the seas a great many ships which are not, in fact, fireproof in every detail, but nevertheless are ships which are allowed to fly the American flag and to carry passengers? We are dealing here with a technical "out" which is being advanced, because the Coast Guard has been asked to make the finding that in some respects these ships are not entirely fireproof.

Mr. POTTER and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from Michigan was first on his feet.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, is it not true that the reason it is necessary for us to have a continuing shipbuilding program is that this country is faced in a very few years with a block obsolescence situation, when our warbuilt ships will all become of age at about the same time? Unless we continue to build a few ships each year, in a few years we shall lose all of our ships at one time. Consequently, we shall be confronted with the problem of mass shipbuilding. One of the great difficulties we have had in the past is that our maritime industry has been a boom-or-bust industry. We expand tremendously during a war or an emergency, and after the war or emergency passes we let our maritime industry slip away.

As the Senator pointed out, the shipbuilding industry is a technical industry. If it is allowed to disintegrate now, and if we do not maintain a certain amount of shipyard facilities, if we do not build a few new ships each year, then at a time when we need ships, we shall not have the wherewithal to produce them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is absolutely correct. There are 14,800 cargo-carrying ships now laid up in "moth-balls." Of those, approximately 300 are not worth reconditioning. All of them are slower than the ordinary merchant ships at the present time. They could be used in a great emergency. We have built approximately 30 so-called "Pioneer Class" ships, but they are of value only for use by the Government, and are not commercially useful. Therefore at the present time we are pretty well down to bedrock with respect to merchant ships which are capable of making a profit.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that from a national defense standpoint it is essential that we have modern type vessels and build up our modern fleet on a gradual basis? In case of an all-out war we would be in dire straits if we did not have the passenger vessels with which to transport our troops.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my colleague that that is why I am on my feet at the present time.

Mr. POTTER. If the Senator from Massachusetts will yield for one further observation, I am sure he realizes that during World War II our Government paid to England more than $100 million for the rent of the two Queens. If we allow our passenger ship program to dwindle, and do not consider the national defense aspects of this program, which incidentally was one of the basic reasons why the subsidy program was adopted, we shall find ourselves at the mercy of our friends and allies, even though they may be in a position to help us. Consequently, in spite of the fact that they have the ships with which to help us in case of an emergency, we shall be at their mercy, and in the long run the cost to us will be 10 times what this program is costing us today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The troop-carrying capacity in this country today is down to one-third what it was in 1939.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. We have heard considerable discussion about nonsubsidized operators. Personally, I do not believe there is a nonsubsidized operator in the passenger trade.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully say that I do not think the Senator is quite correct in that statement. I know that the United Fruit Co. lines and several other lines are not subsidized.

Mr. POTTER. They are in the combination trade.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. POTTER. It is necessary in the interest of national defense to have large passenger vessels available.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator is correct in saying there are no nonsubsidized operators in the strictly passenger trade.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Obviously, under present conditions, in the consideration of appropriations we must take account of the relative importance of the various proposals made. I do not wish to belittle the importance of building up the merchant marine. I understand its importance. But we know that we shall be confronted with a proposal to reduce appropriations for our air forces by a very large amount, possibly more than $4 billion, which will mean the reduction of our air strength from 143 wings to less than 120. I wonder whether my distinguished friend from Massachusetts will tell me whether he thinks this proposed appropriation is as important as maintaining to the greatest extent, within our possibilities and means, the air strength of this country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator has said with reference to maintaining air strength. I have devoted considerable study to the subject to which the Senator has referred, namely, the Air Force. I do not think the Senator wants me to go into an argument on that subject at this time. I simply say that it is not at all clear to me that we are reducing our air strength by cutting out the $5 billion, but I shall not argue with the Senator on that point. I agree that the question is one of relative importance.

I should like to read a paragraph or two from a telegram sent last autumn by President Eisenhower regarding the merchant marine:

I consider the merchant marine to be our fourth arm of defense and vital to the stability and expansion of our foreign trade.

The thousands of skilled workers in our shipyards and in allied industries who have spent their working lives in the building of ships and the machinery for those ships, together with the thousands of merchant seamen who have devoted their lives to the sea, need assurance that never again will the United States neglect its merchant fleet.

That is President Eisenhower's summation of the value of the merchant fleet. With regard to the Air Force, I agree with my distinguished colleague from New York that the question is one of relative importance. The Senator from New York was Governor of his State for many years, as well as a legislator. I know, as he knows, that everything is relative.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to me that next to the paramount importance of national military defense and national spiritual defense, the next most important thing is the subject of the health, welfare, and education of our people. We know that there is a proposal before the Congress of the United States that we cut the appropriations for research in health, mental health, heart disease, cancer, and other deadly diseases, as well as appropriations for education, by an amount of $25 million this year, a cut equal to approximately one-third of the appropriations we have been making for several years past, which in themselves, in my opinion, were inadequate.

When it comes to the question of deciding whether we want to spend this $43 million for the reconditioning and conversion of ships, and the building of facilities for private shipyards, or for some other purpose, the question becomes one of relative importance. I still believe that national defense is of paramount importance. However, if we do not use the money for that purpose, if the choice lies between the things I have mentioned and the continuation of steps to protect and advance the health, welfare, and education of our people, at least so far as I am concerned there is no choice. I doubt whether my distinguished friend from Massachusetts would disagree with me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Unemployed people are the ones who suffer the greatest damage to their health and are most likely to become the recipients of welfare services. There are approximately 100,000 people employed in our shipyards today. If all the shipyards cease to operate, a substantial percentage of those people will be thrown out of work.

For example, in Quincy, Mass., at the Fore River Shipyard, the employment is down. That situation applies to yards everywhere. Of course we must balance between things. However, the fourth arm of our defense is needed in order to protect the security of the country. We cannot have health and welfare unless we have security. The pending amendment would add to the security of our country.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not believe we can have security without health and welfare and decent education and fair and equal opportunity.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall not argue that point with the Senator. I do not want to argue about the Air Force and health at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This morning the junior Senator from Virginia attended a hearing on the question of appropriations for cancer research, to which the distinguished Senator from New York has referred. The House has sent us a cancer research bill which contains an appropriation of approximately $400,000 more than was spent last year for that purpose. So far as the junior Senator from Virginia can influence the action of his subcommittee, the amount we will appropriate this year for cancer research and heart research will not be less than the amount appropriated last year. It may not be as much as some people would like to see provided, and it may not be as much as was recommended in the Truman budget.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, so I may reply to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, provided I do not lose the floor, I yield to the Senator from New York so that he may reply to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to say, even though I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I understand that the appropriation bill to which I made reference has not been reported by the committee. I am referring to recommendations made by Mrs. Hobby with regard to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations.

I have been told that for mental health alone—and that is a subject in which I am deeply interested, because in New York State more than 100,000 persons are confined in mental hospitals—a reduction has been proposed of approximately $10 million; and in the various correlated activities to which I made reference a few minutes ago the proposed appropriations show a reduction of $25 million from those which were made last year and proposed again this year. I do not know what the Appropriation Committee will do.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The House has sent us a bill for vocational education and mental health in an amount which is considerably below the recommendation in the Truman budget. The $3 million which will be contained in this bill, for fiscal 1954, for the shipbuilding program, will not meet that situation ipso facto. It may add $3 million to some phase of that program, but that is all it can do.

So far as cancer and heart research is concerned, involving diseases which are killing so many people today, it is the hope of the Senator from Virginia that the appropriation will not be less than the appropriation last year. When the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts yields the floor the junior Senator from Virginia will make a brief comment in behalf of his amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that I very much hope the Committee on Appropriations will increase the appropriation for cancer and heart research over what it was last year. I believe the appropriations for last year and for the past 2 or 3 years have been completely inadequate to meet the health and welfare problems of our country.

Mr. ROBERTSON. We appropriated a little more than $17 million, and the new budget recommended $26 million. The experts testified today that they could use it all to good advantage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe in what I have had to say I have answered to the questions asked of me. I shall be glad to accept the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and have a vote on the amendment as a whole, if that is agreeable to him.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say, in conclusion, that in 1939 we had 123 ships, capable of carrying 38,000 passengers. Today we have 44 ships, capable of carrying 13,000 passengers. The Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, in 1947, recommended the construction of 46 ships, to be built over a 4-year period. Only 3 of the recommended ships were constructed, and none are being constructed today.

In World War II there were 100 active shipyards in the country. Today there are 8 active shipyards. During World War II more than 1.5 million men were employed in our shipyards. Today less than 100,000 men are employed in the shipyards.

Since World War II 1.5 million deadweight tons of passenger ships have been built, 25 percent for the United Kingdom, and 7.3 percent for the United States.

In 1952, out of a total of 40 passenger ships built, one was built in the United States. Out of 159 tankers built, 8 were built in the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should first like to complete my statement on this point. It is my belief that the amendment is worthwhile and should be adopted, in order to help keep our shipbuilding industry alive. We need the industry very badly in time of emergency.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts to indicate that the passenger business of the United States ship lines is declining. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is declining to a marked degree.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that not due to the tremendous increase in air travel? As I understand, certain types of travel have been completely taken away from the shipping lines by the airlines.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In my opinion that would not apply to the figures which I have given. I do not say that air traffic has not taken business away from passenger ship traffic. It has taken business away from all traffic. However, that would not apply to the figures I have tried to give.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I right in assuming that the two companies concerned, the Moore-McCormack Lines and the Grace Line, carry traffic which comprises largely tourist business to South America?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not understand that it is necessarily tourist business. It is all kinds of business—cargo, passenger, and everything else.

Mr. AIKEN. But a businessman going to South America or to Africa would naturally fly, would he not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The traffic goes both ways. I assume that some people still do not like to fly. I will say to my friend from Vermont that the amendment calls for ships to be built under section 504. None of these companies, if it does not think it can operate ships successfully, need try to get a contract and a construction subsidy. It is entirely up to them; they are the prime contractors.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in understanding that the Eisenhower budget did not call for this appropriation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Or contract authorizations?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. It has been called to my attention that the decline in passenger traffic on American ships is not caused by lack of business, but by lack of ships.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Massachusetts understand that the President and the entire Cabinet have urged immediate participation of the United States, jointly with Canada, in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes. I would say to my distinguished friend—and I do not know whether we will differ ultimately on that point—if we build the St. Lawrence seaway project, I hope we will have American oceangoing ships which will use it. If we do not build the ships, we will not have them.

Mr. AIKEN. One argument in favor of it, as made by the administration, I believe, is that it would provide an inland haven for the construction of ships, in the event of war.

However, I do not wish to get into an argument on this point with the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to his colleague?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Are not more than 10,000 persons, approximately, now employed at the Fore River yard?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have the exact figure among my papers.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not true, as my colleague has said, that unless the appropriation now proposed is made, many men at the Fore River yard and many men at other private shipyards in the United States will be thrown out of employment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not also true that already the Navy Department is taking work from the Navy yards and is turning it over to the private yards, in order to maintain employment at the private yards at least at a minimum level?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. If these ships are not built and if other ships are not constructed, is it not a fact that any yard, such as the Fore River yard—which had 10,000 men working earlier this year—within 1½ years will be almost completely shut down?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. My colleague knows—because he and I have discussed the problem with officials of the Navy Department—that they believe it is vitally important that the private yards be kept in operation, because in time of emergency they will be needed for ship construction.

Mr. KENNEDY. Has not my colleague been informed in the last year or so by the Navy Department that employment throughout the country in the navy yards is now being substantially reduced because of the necessity of maintaining at reasonable levels employment at the private yards?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the reason that has been stated.

Let me say now, in answer to the question previously asked by my colleague, that at the present time the total employment at the Fore River yard is approximately 8,000, and it will decline to 3,400 by July 1, 1954.

Mr. KENNEDY. And after that date, the decline will continue.

Is it not a fact that since the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1937, and even before then, it has been the policy of the United States to maintain at least at a minimum level the construction skills and the operations at the private yards? Is not that an essential part of our national defense?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course that is so. Both my colleague and I know that Massachusetts men have always gone down to the sea in ships. There are a certain number of ship-construction yards in Massachusetts; and those yards are, so we have always believed, necessary as a part of our national economy and as a part of our national security.

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course, there can be no doubt that this is a subsidy; but, if we do not grant the subsidy, these ships will be built abroad, as my colleague has said. Perhaps they will be built in Japan. Is not that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. KENNEDY. Therefore, we must decide today whether the subsidy we pay is worthwhile in keeping these men at work, and, even more important, in keeping the skills collected within the private yards. Is not that the decision we have to make?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. In view of the fact that subsidies in many other fields are not alien to the activities of this body, it seems to me that we now have to decide whether the appropriation we are being requested to make for this purpose will be worthwhile.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The important question is whether, in subsidizing an industry, the industry is necessary as a part of our security in time of need.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that the private yards on the west coast have been the hardest hit, from the point of view of maintaining employment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I cannot answer that question on a relative basis. I believe that the west-coast yards have been hard hit, but I do not have detailed information about how hard they have been hit.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate the courtesy of my colleague in answering the questions I have asked.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank my colleague for asking them.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly sympathize with anyone who is threatened with loss of employment. I think it is a calamitous situation, and I believe that both private and public industries should do everything within their power to prevent it.

However, I wonder whether the Senator from Massachusetts realizes that the great navy yard at Brooklyn, N. Y., has because of the diversion of many naval-construction projects, had to reduce its force by 4,000 or 5,000 men.

Although I very greatly sympathize with a man in Boston, California, Delaware, or any other place, who has lost his employment or is threatened with loss of employment, yet there is not much difference between the loss of employment by that man and the loss of employment by a man who previously has worked in one of the Federal navy yards—for instance, that in New York or those in other parts of the Nation. Those men have devoted their lives to the vocation in which they are engaged. Yet because of the diversion from Government navy yards to private ship yards, large numbers of those men are now unemployed or are threatened with loss of employment.

I assure the Senator from Massachusetts that I do not lack sympathy for persons who have been working in private shipyards and who may be out of work at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me reply to the Senator from New York by reading

an excerpt from a letter written by Rear Adm. Homer N. Wallin, Chief of the Bureau of Ships. His letter is dated May 28, 1953, and reads in part as follows:

> This reduction is part of a general curtailment at all of the naval shipyards, the principal reasons therefor being the following:
>
> * * * * *
>
> (c) The necessity for diverting more repair work, principally on noncombatant ships, to our private yards. These yards, as you can appreciate, must maintain a nucleus of vital skills and facilities, in order to be prepared to undertake their planned mobilization tasks.

So Admiral Wallin, who is Chief of the Bureau of Ships, informs us that in part the reduction at the navy yards is for the purpose of keeping the private shipyards in operation.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts does not dispute the statement I have made, namely, that the reduction in employment at the navy yards is due, at least in part, to the diversion of work from the Government shipyards to private shipyards—which I believe may be perfectly sound.

I also wish to say that I am sincerely sorry for anyone who loses employment, and I would do my utmost to prevent such loss of employment.

On the other hand, many persons will also lose employment when there is a curtailment of airplane production. I am afraid there is no way to prevent such loss of employment if we persist in our plan to cut down our defense activities.

I am thoroughly in opposition to cutting down our defense appropriations and our defense activities, because I do not believe we have yet reached a level of security which would indicate the wisdom of such a course.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the present time I do not wish to debate with the Senator from New York the subject of our air defense. Only this morning I listened to testimony by the Secretary for Air and by one of his generals—the one in charge of the budget, I believe. Both of them said the present plans were not to cut down in any way on the building of our combatant air fleet. Incidentally, the transport fleet is to have 1 less wing, but in the National Guard and in the Reserve there are to be 7 more wings than were planned under the Truman budget.

I must make that statement because of the statement which has been made by the Senator from New York. At another time I shall be glad to debate that subject with him, in answer to any questions he may care to ask. However, I do not think that is a part of the ship-construction problem.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had intended not to speak today. In fact, the representative in the Senate of the Independent Party was making a valiant effort this afternoon to speak less and to listen more. But, Mr. President, the trouble with listening is that often we sit here and listen to such fallacious and unsound arguments that if we are to live up to our obligations as Members of the Senate we must make a record against such arguments. In my judgment the fallacies and unsound public policy arguments stated this afternoon by the Senator from Massachusetts must be answered for the record. I propose to do so very briefly.

Mr. President, in response to the arguments made by the Senator from Massachusetts, I wish to say we must apply some basic principles to the entire problem of ship subsidies.

Judging from the argument made this afternoon by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], one might suggest that the motto of the Eisenhower administration in this field is this: Handouts for big business as support for millionaires are proper; but if we provide price supports for the farmers of the United States, in order that they may maintain a high purchasing standard, and thus may prevent the Nation from tobogganing into a depression, that is creeping socialism.

It is surprising how easy it is to listen to spokesmen of the administration as they talk about sudsidies and handouts and giveaways for vested interests in this country; but when one makes a fight on the floor of the Senate for the little people of America, he is a Socialist. He is smeared with the charge that he is an advocate of creeping socialism. But permit me to tell what is being overlooked by those who take that view. They are overlooking the sights of the little people of America who are beginning to see through the game that is being played. They are beginning to recognize that the present administration is strong for the "haves," but suffering from myopia when it comes to the "have-nots."

Mr. President, I wish to say that the argument here this afternoon in support of this ship subsidy amendment in my judgement, is economic-isolationism rampant. We hear a great deal in this country about "trade—not aid." We talk a great deal about sound international relations. But I suggest most respectfully, that this afternoon, we are again overlooking a fact we had better notice before it is too late. It is that the economic productive power of our allies is the greatest defense weapon the American people have.

I have never known a time when a make-work program was sound economically. And if the assumption is true, though I do not accept the premise, that the ships can be converted in Japan at a great saving to American taxpayers, that is exactly where they ought to be converted. They ought to be converted on the basis of sound international economics. They ought to be converted there on the basis of a sound international policy, recognizing that we simply cannot have our economic cake and eat it, too.

We had better recognize, Mr. President, that it does not do us very much good, in the long run, to build the munitions and weapons of war and give them to our allies, if as a result of a selfish nationalistic economic policy in this country we are leaving economically weak our allies who use these weapons.

Mr. President, do you want to know why our allies are losing morale? Do you want to know why we are losing friends very rapidly around the world, among the allied countries? It is because they are not seeing very much advantage in the policy we are following in the world-defense program, so far as their economic productive power is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oregon call a subsidy of $43,200,000 a WPA program for the ship operators and shipbuilders?

Mr. MORSE. I think it is in that class; which leads me to the next point I desire to make.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does not the Senator believe that it is better to have private capital join with Government capital to construct the ships, to keep them on the seas, to keep them in repair, to keep them ever ready to meet the needs of defense, rather than have the Government do the whole job?

Mr. MORSE. That leads me to the very next point I wish to make, Mr. President. I say most respectfully and kindly in the RECORD today that I have much greater confidence in the American shipbuilding industry than apparently do the Senators from Massachusetts and Maryland. I know something about the shipbuilding industry. In my judgment the American shipbulding industry is a much stronger industry economically and competitively than the argument here this afternoon would indicate. It is not true that it cannot compete unless we give them huge subsidies to the extent to which they have been granted. For years the shipping industry has been playing a racket, Mr. President. It has been using a fear argument on the Congress and on the American people. It has been planting here on the floor of the Senate for years scarecrows to the effect that we are not going to have a ship industry in our country unless we hand out millions of dollars of subsidy. It frightened us and frightened us with its "wolf," "wolf" cries.

Mr. President, it is not true that all segments of the industry have needed a huge subsidy. I grant that we need to work out some better cooperative contracts, not in the form of unreasonable subsidies, but diverting more of the so-called Government shipyard work to the private yards. This is true particularly of the repair work. If we did that it will be found that they would be placed in a stronger competitive position than the argument this afternoon made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would seem to indicate.

Of course, they are going to accept a huge, unreasonable subsidy as long as we offer to give it to them. But let me say that in my judgment the time has come, for at least 1 year—for us to take the "gravy bowl" away from them, and see what happens. For at least 1 year, Mr. President, let us make clear to them that we are going to have a little better understanding with the shipbuilding industry in this country than we have had heretofore, because it happens to be my judgment, since I have gone into the

books of a good many ship companies in this country that we have been giving them "bowls of gravy," each year, to which they were not entitled. The gravy, Mr. President, is being taken away from the little people of this country through high taxes with which to pay them subsidies. I want to stress the point that a make-work program is economically unsound. I know, as the Senator from Massachusetts points out, that, of course, we cannot afford to lose the shipbuilding skills of the American workers. But I do not accept his premise that these huge subsidies are necessary in order to maintain a shipbuilding potential in this country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Newport News Drydock & Shipbuilding Co., which is probably the most efficient shipbuilding company in the country, can produce ships at a tonnage cost lower than that of most of the foreign yards?

Mr. MORSE. I do not know it to be a fact, but I know that is the claim.

Mr. President, I close by saying that I think this issue affords an opportunity, with the evidence that has been placed in the RECORD this afternoon, to realize that there is no proved urgency in this matter. I am satisfied that the overage argument in regard to these particular ships is not very sound, for the reason that the ships really have had a great deal of remodeling work done on them within recent years. We ought to deny the subsidy, this afternoon, and let this thing jell for a year. Let us serve notice on the shipbuilding industry that we are going to call a halt to what they have come to accept as almost a certainty, namely, a guaranty on the basis of their fear argument, of almost any subsidy, in whatever amount they ask.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, I yield gladly. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Oregon was asked, as I understood, whether it was not true that the Newport News Drydock & Shipbuilding Co. could build ships on a tonnage basis cheaper than the European yards could build them. The Senator from Virginia will admit that that is the biggest shipbuilding company in the world, and is, in his opinion, the most efficient one in this country. But it cannot pay the wages it now pays, which are the very top wages, and build passenger and cargo ships as cheaply as they can be built in any foreign shipyard I know anything about.

Mr. MORSE. I merely desire to say, Mr. President, I do not think any great catastrophe will be suffered by that company for a year or two if we do not pass the bill carrying the subsidy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland to the committee amendment on page 37, line 25.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think we should get the RECORD straight with reference to this amendment. The senior Senator from Massachusetts pointed out a shortage in passenger ships. I emphasize the fact that the passenger ship situation has nothing whatever to do with the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

The purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland is to take care of the conversion of three particular ships for the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] wondered to whom the money would be paid——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Did not the Senator from Maryland tell the Senate and the Senator from Oklahoma that if the amendment of the Senator from Maryland should be adopted, the money paid out by the Government by reason of the amendment would go in its entirely to one shipbuilding company?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is my understanding: one shipping company, the American-Hawaiian, will receive the entire benefit.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not know how the Senator could get that understanding. I do not know that it is a fact. It may be true. The construction will be on the basis of competitive bidding. I hope the contract goes to a Maryland yard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not say it would not go to one Maryland yard. I said the one company involved is the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I want to thank the Senator from Delaware. I have asked that question a number of times and I failed to get an answer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to point out this additional information in reference to these three ships about which we are talking. Two years ago, we sold five ships to the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., five C–4's. The 3 ships about which we are talking are 3 of those 5 ships. They are not 20 years old. They were built in 1946 at a cost to the American taxpayers of around $7½ million for each ship. They were not battle-scarred ships. They were new ships coming out of the yard in 1946.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that the purpose of converting these ships is to make them more practical and economical, which they are not in their present condition.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The three vessels are dry-cargo C–4 vessels. They will be used primarily for the hauling of ore from Labrador. When that cannot be accomplished, owing to the freezing conditions in that part of the world, the ships will be used as oil tankers, as a part of the standby fleet.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say each ship was built at a cost of $7½ million?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Government built these five ships from 1944 to 1946. These ships were the *Mount Davis*, costing $7,396,040; the *Mount Greylock*, costing $7,895,685; the *Mount Whitney*, costing $8,294,951; the *Mount Rogers*, costing $7,461,264; and the *Mount Vickery*, costing $7,520,875.

Those five ships are all C–4's. In 1951 the ships were declared surplus and were sold to the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. for $1,547,338 each or at a loss of more than $30 million to the American taxpayers.

Today we are asked to appropriate $4 million to reconvert three of these same ships.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that the Saltonstall amendment as included in the bill provides only for new construction of passenger and cargo ships, and not for reconversion, and that we have not yet voted on the Butler amendment providing for reconversion of the ships about which the Senator from Delaware is speaking and about which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] spoke and which the members of the committee, including the Senator from Virginia voted against?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct. The Butler amendment provides for conversion as well as construction. That is the subject about which we have been talking.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The ships were sold under the Ship Sales Act of 1946. The purchase price was arrived at by the statutory formula prescribed in that act. All the Senator from Delaware says may be perfectly true, but the fact remains that the Labrador mines will open in the summer of 1954, and we have no cargo vessels to carry the ore. We need these ships. We also need them for oil tankers.

If we look back into history we may find some little thing that would sound bad, but the essentiality of this situation is that we need these ships very badly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have heard much said about the need for these ships. They are good ships. I do not question that. They were among the best ships we had. But with all due respect to the need for these ships from a national defense standpoint, this is not the only case in which we have practically given away our ships. Since the

outbreak of the war in Korea in November 1950, we sold 3 others of the same type ships which cost us an average of $7½ million each for as little as $102,000 apiece. All I am trying to say is that we should make up our minds. Let us build and equip the ships and not give them away.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It has been stated that we sold some Army and Navy surplus materials which had cost approximately $20 an item for a very small sum. We need these ships as we now need the surpluses which we have sold. We should like to have them back, but we cannot get them back unless we buy them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have been in the Senate for 6 years, and I have heard the same argument every year. I say to the Senator from Maryland that the ships to which I have referred were sold, under the provisions of a bill which was passed by Congress over the objection of the administration which was in power at that time. Both the Senator's amendment and the committee amendment are being offered today in opposition to an administration which says that we do not need the $40 million requested on the basis of the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am the Chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Within the past 10 days we have been holding hearings and representatives of the Maritime Commission and of the Department of Commerce have testified as to the essentiality of these ships.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Other representatives of those agencies have said we do not need them. Perhaps there should be a little coordination in those agencies.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am only telling the Senator from Delaware what I heard while sitting as a member of a committee of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that on page 403 of the House hearings the Administrator, in the presence of high officials of the Department of Commerce, testified that there was no urgency with respect to these ships?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. In addition to that, even if the ships are not converted, they are still there, still afloat. The Government can get them anytime it wishes to do so. The ships are not going anywhere.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The ships, if not converted here, will be converted in Japan, I would remind the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was a member of the same committee to which the Senator has referred. In the Senate we have complained many times about the fact that there are no fixed cargo rates on these ships. The Government has no control as far as rates are concerned. During the Korean war, shipping rates jumped 2 or 3 times above what they had been. Now that the shipping companies are getting a little short of cargo, they want to hook their expense accounts to the Federal Treasury.

If we are going to finance these ships and subsidize them, the very least we can do is to extend the control, so that in an emergency the private companies cannot highjack the United States Government.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Certainly I wish to protect the interests of the United States. Certainly I am for protecting the Treasury of the United States. I am just as conscious of high taxation as is the Senator from Delaware. But the ships will be reconverted either here or in Japan. If they are to be reconverted in Japan, the United States will lose 1,000 shipyard workers for a whole year from the standpoint of their labor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, the United States Government is making contributions to the Japanese Government to get Japan on its feet. If we can put some of them to work, whether it be by building ships or not, perhaps we can get out of making further contributions. So I am not too much concerned about that particular point. As long as we are still having to pay dollars to these countries we should get something in return.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Delaware said that I was only partly correct with reference to the parliamentary situation, so I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is not the question before the Senate on agreeing to the Butler amendment to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the distinguished Senator from Delaware will have to admit that I was 100-percent correct, and not partly correct, when I said that the committee was against conversion, and that I, individually, was against conversion. Yet the Senator from Delaware said the Senator from Virginia, on the parliamentary situation, while both amendments were pending, was only partly correct, and he continued to argue against conversion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I said that a representative of the Committee on Appropriations, who is present on the floor, had indicated that the committee was in support of conversion. That is what we have been speaking about all afternoon. But it makes no difference whether we are speaking about subsidy for conversion or construction; the fact is that the administration was against both amendments, and frankly, I think that they ought to be voted on together and defeated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The theory of voting on both amendments together is that if an amendment which is not thought desirable is added to the committee amendment, both amendments can be defeated together.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I certainly do not think the amendment of the Senator from Maryland would improve the committee amendment, however I think both amendments should be defeated so that this $44 million may be saved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Delaware characterize this program as an unsinkable seagoing pork-barrel? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the committee amendment on page 37, line 25.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	Millikin
Barrett	Hayden	Monroney
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Hoey	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Payne
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Kefauver	Smathers
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Kuchel	Stennis
Ellender	Langer	Symington
Ferguson	Lehman	Taft
Flanders	Malone	Thye
Fulbright	Mansfield	Watkins
George	Martin	Wiley
Gore	Maybank	Williams
Green	McClellan	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] to the committee amendment beginning on page 37, line 25.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the hour is growing late. Rather than delay a vote, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief statement which I have prepared explaining why I regard the committee amendment, without the Butler amendment, as a part of a proper defense program. Also I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a memorandum prepared, as I understand, by the Propeller Club of America, which is dedicated to the promotion of the merchant marine.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

If, as naval officers have so frequently claimed, our merchant marine in time of war, is a vital and necessary auxiliary of our naval strength, then the only proper way for those of us who are just as strong believers in economy as the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to consider the Saltonstall amendment to the Commerce bill

for a continuation of merchant marine shipbuilding subsidies is to decide whether or not we want a strong and efficient merchant marine and shipbuilding and repairing facilities in this Nation in the event of another world war.

Commentators are now predicting that the Congress will accept the President's defense budget which makes a cut of over a billion dollars in the naval program which the Chief of the Bureau of Ships advises me will be reflected in reduced operations next year in the Government shipyards and a cut of some $5 billion in the Air Force, which may not slow airplane deliveries in fiscal 1954, but is definitely geared to a program of 120 wings instead of 143 which last year we thought would be a proper goal.

But the same commentators likewise frankly say that in accepting this reduced military budget the Congress is going to take a calculated risk. What is that calculated risk? Since the year of 1956 has been set as our goal of preparedness, it means that we either, on a fair appraisal of Soviet intentions or else on the basis of the hope that is said to spring eternal in the human heart, are guessing that Russia will not start World War III prior to 1956. Apparently no one has ventured a prophecy beyond that time.

So to know what would be the status of our merchant marine by 1956 in the event we ended all shipbuilding subsidies, I asked the present chairman of shipbuilding of the Maritime Administration to give me his appraisal of that situation. He replied that we would probably have as many merchant ships in 1956 as we have now but that they would be 3 years older and of course some of them might have outlived their usefulness, but that without the shipbuilding subsidy practically every private shipbuilding yard in the Nation would be closed down in 1956.

I, and just a few other Members of the Senate, have been in the Congress for the past 20 years but certainly every Member of the Senate is well aware of the shipping problem which confronted us in both World Wars. Prior to our entry in World War I German submarines sank so many merchant ships that Great Britain was threatened with a serious food problem and we built ships as fast as our capacity permitted to help solve that problem of transportation. In the early stages of World War II, the destruction of merchant shipping by German submarines was even more serious. At one time they were sinking an average of one ship a day, which was greater than the replacement rate. Hitler might have won his war had not our fine Navy finally solved the submarine problem and greatly reduced the casualty rate. And that action, of course, was supplemented by feverish activity both in established shipyards and in new emergency shipyards to build replacement vessels. Our first experiment was with concrete ships, largely I assume because at that time we had more concrete than we had steel. Those ships proved to be absolutely worthless except perhaps for use as breakwaters to protect a ferry landing, as was done at Cape Charles, Va.

Then we built, at great expense for the value received, a lot of steel ships. Everyone will recall, of course, the boast of Mr. Henry Kaiser of how fast he was turning out those ships. We used those steel ships during World War II because we had to but after the war was over no private shipping line would use them because they were too slow and their carrying capacity too small to make their operation profitable.

We know that as of today the Soviet Union has more snorkel-type submarines than the Germans had when they were sinking merchant ships faster than we and our allies could replace them. Should another war come, it will not be limited to atomic bombing. Those Russian submarines will go into action against the shipping of the free world and any ships that can't do better than 20 knots will be like a sitting duck for those snorkel submarines. The problem of naval defense against that type of submarine warfare will be even greater than it was against Hitler's submarine war.

As much, therefore, as I believe in economy and as earnestly as I desire to see a balanced budget and then appropriate tax relief, I am compelled to regard the continuation of the operation of our private shipyards as a vital element of our defense program and that the shipbuilding subsidy, without which we cannot build passenger-cargo ships in this country to compete with the lower cost shipyards of the world, is not only a proper item of our defense program but a vitally necessary one.

MEMORANDUM RE THE NECESSITY FOR UNDERTAKING THE CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL PASSENGER SHIPS WITHOUT DELAY

It has been conclusively determined by the armed services, as a result of experience in World Wars I and II and, more recently, the present Korean war, that the shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry is an indispensable element of the national security, so much so that it, together with the shipping industry and other elements of maritime industry, as a whole, are termed the fourth arm of the national defense.

The part played by the shipbuilding and ship-repairing industry in any national emergency is the production of the additional ships required for the transport of men, munitions, and supplies overseas, and the maintenance and repair of the ships already in active operation to the end that the logistic requirements of the armed services may be satisfactorily complied with. Without that essential transportation, no war can be successfully prosecuted.

It has been established in the past wars that the ships available at the commencement of hostilities are hopelessly inadequate and that their numbers and types must be multiplied manyfold by new construction in order to meet the exigencies of the situation. In the past, fortunately, we had allies to attempt to hold the line and the considerable period that intervened before we became actually involved enabled at least a start on a ship production program and the expansion of facilities and organizations necessary therefor.

Certainly we cannot afford again to rely upon a period of grace to get ready to defend ourselves in the event of war. Undoubtedly, the next one, if it should come, will be sudden, with this country in the forefront. We have been engaged for the past several years in preparing for such an eventuality by the training of troops and production of military equipment and supplies of all kinds. At the same time we have neglected to provide the means to assure the use of those troops, equipment and supplies, viz, overseas transportation, which is equally as important as the items transported.

Heading the list in order of importance is the transportation of troops for which passenger ships in active operation are required. The potential troop lift of existing passenger ships is hopelessly inadequate and many more are needed. The conclusions of the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, an impartial industry group, included, among other things, in its report submitted to the President in November 1947, a recommendation for the construction of 46 passenger ships, over the 4-year period from 1948–51 inclusive, as essential to national security.

Nearly 6 years have elapsed since the recommendation was made, and in that period 3 of the 46 ships contemplated in the recommendation for a 4-year period have been constructed and are in service, with no others as yet on order.

The 4 passenger ships originally recommended for the 1954 budget, 2 for Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., and 2 for Grace Lines, Inc., would at least add that many new passenger ships to the active fleet. That would only make a total of 7 ships, if, and when they are completed at least 2 years from now. Even then, there would be an almost complete failure to accomplish the recommended 4-year program, the net result being only 15 percent of that program, in 8 years instead of 4.

In the meantime, the ships intended to be replaced grow older, more expensive to operate and offer little assurance as to the safe transportation of troops under current conditions of sea warfare.

The further deferment of the construction of the four passenger ships under consideration is inconsistent with the national policy on the merchant marine as set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, and reiterated in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, with the contractual obligations of the owners involved, with the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on the Merchant Marine, and is highly dangerous to the national security.

It also is completely inconsistent with the position taken by the administration, as evidenced by the telegram of October 3, 1952, from the President of the United States, then a candidate, to the president of the Propeller Club of the United States at the annual convention of that organization in conjunction with the American Merchant Marine Conference in Los Angeles, and with the policy statement made at that meeting by Senator SALTONSTALL, selected by the President as chairman of a special committee of experienced legislators to advise him on merchant-marine problems.

Entirely aside from the economic considerations involved and the direct effect upon a vital industry, the shipbuilding and ship repairing industry, the elimination of contractual authority and necessary funds required under the law for Government assistance in the construction of these four passenger vessels is unwise and dangerous to the national security for the reasons already cited and certainly is inconsistent with other preparations now under way to meet whatever eventuality may occur, however impelling the necessity for governmental economy may be.

In the final analysis, the proposed elimination of funds for new ship construction in the appropriation for the fiscal year 1954, does not actually effect any saving to the Federal Government. It is merely a deferment to the fiscal year 1955, at which time undoubtedly the necessity for Government economy will be just as important as it now is. The amount involved for the fiscal year 1954 is relatively small and thus cannot have any far-reaching effect upon the national budget. All that is required is the necessary contractual authority together with an appropriation of sufficient funds to take care of any financial obligations, insofar as the Government construction subsidy is concerned, that may be incurred during the coming fiscal year. The construction period undoubtedly will approximate at least 2 and possibly 3 years. Thus the major part of the Government construction subsidy will not be due and payable until the fiscal years 1955 and 1956.

It must not be overlooked that the construction of these passenger ships, so vital to national security, under the law is a joint undertaking of Government and private industry, with the latter assuming the greater part of the financial burden. With private industry making such a financial contribution to the production of vital elements of a national defense program, it would be shortsighted and ill-advised to defer that program now. Such a deferment would be compromising with national security with no resulting benefit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mary-

land [Mr. BUTLER] to the committee amendment on page 37, line 25.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 37, after line 23.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are now considering the committee amendment, which carries with it an ultimate expenditure of $43,200,000. During the past 6 years we have spent $453 million in subsidies for ship construction, and there is approximately $60 million more due, for which we are appropriating in the next item in the present bill. So we have already poured out over a half billion dollars on subsidies since 1948. We are now asked to spend $43 million more for a program which is grossly wasteful, which subsidizes private business, and which has reeked with corruption so far as passenger ships are concerned.

The Comptroller General of the United States has repeatedly called attention to the gross abuses in the granting of subsidies for the construction of large passenger liners. He is refusing at this moment to certify payment of $6⅓ million which was granted only a few months ago by the Federal Maritime Administration.

I hold in my hand a statement by the attorney for the General Accounting Office, Mr. Casey, which exposes the proceedings of the Maritime Board. I think it is about time to stop this giveaway of public funds and begin to save money for the American people. It is time to preserve the taxpayers from subsidizing uneconomic enterprises.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to reply very briefly to what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has said.

We have been considering this subject for a long time. If we believe in ship construction, if we believe in the maintenance of a shipyard industry to enable us to be prepared in time of emergency or in time of war, I hope the committee amendment will be adopted.

Let me point out a few facts. In 1939 we had 123 passenger ships with a carrying capacity of 38,000. Today we have 44 such vessels with a carrying capacity of 13,000. During the past year, 1952, of a total of 40 passenger ships built, only one was built in the United States. Of 159 tankers, only 8 were built in the United States.

Only 3 passenger ships have been constructed in the United States in the past 5 years, whereas the President's Committee on the Merchant Marine recommended that 46 such ships be built. Under those conditions I hope the committee amendment will be adopted.

The present President of the United States calls the merchant marine the fourth arm of our defense. He has been a strong advocate of continuation of the merchant marine. If we wish to be dependent entirely upon foreign merchant shipping in time of need or in time of war, then we do not need to go forward with any subsidies such as this. If we believe in maintaining a shipbuilding industry in this country, I hope we shall adopt the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 37, after line 23. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—24

Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Potter
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Knowland	Taft
Ellender	Kuchel	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Young

NAYS—54

Aiken	George	Langer
Barrett	Gore	Lehman
Bricker	Green	Mansfield
Bush	Griswold	Martin
Carlson	Hill	Maybank
Case	Hoey	McClellan
Clements	Holland	Monroney
Cooper	Humphrey	Morse
Daniel	Jackson	Mundt
Douglas	Jenner	Neely
Duff	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Eastland	Kefauver	Purtell
Ferguson	Kerr	Russell
Fulbright	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Smathers	Sparkman	Thye
Smith, Maine	Stennis	Watkins
Smith, N. C.	Symington	Williams

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Gillette	Magnuson
Butler, Nebr.	Goldwater	McCarran
Byrd	Hennings	McCarthy
Cordon	Hunt	Murray
Dirksen	Ives	Tobey
Frear	Long	Welker

So the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) rescinding the action of the Speaker in signing the bill (S. 1550) to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom, and requesting the return of papers by the House.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with Senate concurrent resolution 31, the message of the Senate announcing its agreement to the House amendments to the bill (S. 1550) to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialists categories, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. KILDAY, and Mr. DURHAM had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5471) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5471) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against

the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 10, to strike out "$64,000,000" and insert "$59,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 1, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$16,300,000" and insert "$15,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 9, after the word "models", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$7,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 25, after "(34 U. S. C. 1121–1123)", to strike out "$349,800" and insert "$379,800", and on page 42, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$860,000" and insert "$890,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Public Roads," on page 45, line 21, after the word "expended", to strike out "$510,000,000, which sum is composed of $387,500,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1952, $119,500,000" and insert "$475,000,000, which sum is composed of $387,500,000, the balance of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1952, $84,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 15, after the word "expended", to strike out "$15,000,000, which sum is composed of $3,400,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1952, and $11,600,000" and insert "$14,000,000, which sum is composed of $3,400,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1952, and $10,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, at the beginning line 13, to strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$5,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards," on page 51, after line 2, to insert:

Working capital fund: Hereafter the working capital fund created by the act of June 29, 1950 (64 Stat. 279), may be credited with advances from applicable appropriations for the cost of facilities and services to be financed by said fund, and said advances shall cover the same charges as those for which reimbursements are made to the fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau," on page 51, line 17, after the words "only", to strike out "$24,700,000" and insert "$27,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this committee amendment would increase by $2,300,000 the amount of the appropriation voted by the House of Representatives for the maintenance of the Weather Bureau.

The purpose of the committee amendment is to keep in operation certain of the less efficient and less necessary weather stations.

Although I realize that weather stations are popular with local constituencies and local newspapers which wish to report the local weather, nevertheless the House of Representatives, in an effort to obtain economy, voted to curtail the program by approximately 9 percent.

The committee amendment would restore the appropriation to the amount voted last year, and would not provide for any real economy.

Therefore, I hope the appropriation voted by the House of Representatives for this item will be allowed to stand. It will be 214 percent of the amount appropriated in 1944.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the committee amendment affecting the Weather Bureau provides for an increase in the appropriation voted by the House of Representatives. In one way this subject is controversial because it involves the closing of Weather Bureau stations.

The Senate Appropriations Committee felt, and the testimony will reveal, that, day in and day out, nothing is closer to the average citizen than the Weather Bureau stations. Certainly the average citizen turns to the radio, the television, the press, and various other means of communication, to learn about the weather. That is so both in the case of farmers and in the case of those who live in urban or suburban areas. This item also has a bearing on the safety of aircraft and the safety of ships at sea or shipping on the lakes. It is tied in very intimately with the life of the average citizen.

I venture to assert that every Member of the Senate has some contact with the weather during the course of the day.

Under the circumstances, the committee has voted to restore the full amount of the item, by adding $2,300,000 to the appropriation voted by the House of Representatives.

I wish to say very frankly to the Senate that so far as I was concerned—and I was chairman of the subcommittee, as well as chairman of the full committee—I favored restoring only $2 million. But the full committee in its wisdom voted to restore $2,300,000.

Appropriations to provide adequate reporting of the weather, for the benefit of the individual citizen, to help him in his planning and to promote his safety, probably come as close to home as almost any other appropriation item.

I realize that the committee amendment provides for an increase over the amount of appropriation voted by the House of Representatives. There is a difference of opinion as to what weather stations would be eliminated if the increased amount were not provided.

The chairman of the committee must support the recommendation of the committee. Although the committee's recommendation is for a somewhat larger amount than I myself felt necessary, nevertheless I feel that the recommendation of the committee can be justified.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. For years we have been building up a good system of weather reporting over the Nation. I believe it is essential to those who do a great deal of flying. The weather stations are being well located. In the past few years we have had some demonstrations of how essential this service is.

I am not certain whether the proper amount of appropriation for this purpose should be an additional $2 million or an additional $2,300,000, but certainly I hope nothing will be done to curtail the safety of those who fly or the safety of the present aviation activities.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I share the view of the Senator from Kansas. I believe that one of the factors taken into consideration by the committee, when it voted for the larger appropriation, was that it is essential that safety be maintained for aviation. For that purpose, we must have the most accurate weather information possible.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In addition to the statement made by the Senator from Kansas about the importance of weather reports in connection with the operation of airplanes, let me say that such reports also are essential to the farmers, in their activities every day of the week. In fact, the Weather Bureau was originated for the benefit of the farmer, so that he could know when to prepare to plant or when to prepare to harvest the various crops. Every farmer in the Nation is interested in the Weather Bureau. Of course, those who travel by airplane are likewise interested in the Weather Bureau.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in understanding that the restoration of this appropriation item to $27 million will permit us to have assurance that no weather stations will be closed, but that the full complement of weather stations now existing will continue to operate?

Mr. BRIDGES. The chairman of the committee cannot guarantee that this amendment, if adopted, will mean that no weather stations will be closed. I

understand that the committee amendment, if adopted, will pretty well meet that situation, but I would not wish to guarantee that there would not be some closings.

I hope the Weather Bureau will take due notice of this debate and also of the action taken by the committee, and will proceed accordingly; but I could not make a guaranty to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the report I notice the following:

> With the amount provided, the committee feels that no weather stations will have to be closed.

Mr. BRIDGES. I hope that is true. But the Senator from Florida asked me a question, and I do not dare give him a "yes" or "no" answer, because we had considerable difficulty at times in obtaining the full facts about the Weather Bureau. Finally I obtained a list of the Weather Bureau stations in the various States and Territories. I think it might be wise to have that list placed in the RECORD. It shows fairly well the setup.

I believe it is the thought and intention of the committee that if the committee amendment is adopted, there will be no closings. I shall not say absolutely that there will be none, although that is my understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly hope that understanding is correct, because at least in our part of the country it is highly necessary that the weather stations remain open. They are our avenues of warning in the hurricane season, and they are our avenues of warning against freeze and frost during the winter season. The continued operation of those stations is essential to our shipping industry, our shrimp industry, and our fishing industry. The operation of those stations is of very great importance to our State. It seems to me it would be very poor economy to deprive our people of the benefits which are obtained from the operation of those stations.

I certainly hope the judgment of the committee will be endorsed by the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, perhaps I can clarify the matter a little further. The intention of the Appropriations Committee in submitting this amendment was to provide sufficient funds so that the Weather Bureau would not be forced to close stations. It was the understanding of the Appropriations Committee, in voting to restore the funds, that as a result the Weather Bureau would not be forced to close stations. I assume that is correct, and I assume the Weather Bureau will take due notice of the committee's action and will take due notice of the action of the Senate.

Mr. President, in closing I may say there is nothing that either the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Florida could do if it should suddenly be decided to close some stations. The intent is not to do so, and I would express that very clearly to the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Kansas, and other Senators who have made inquiry. I know the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has a very deep interst in this item, as have other Senators. I hope the amendment of the committee will be adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I should like to express the hope and the understanding that the hands of the Weather Bureau will not be tied in the making of such consolidations as might be in order, when stations are found within a few miles of each other, and in establishing new stations in the areas where there are from 300 to 500 miles between stations. There came to my attention during the past week one station, the closing of which had been suggested. That station was within 10 miles of another station. Possibly it should be closed; I do not want the record to prevent such economy. I know of another point where an effort has been made to establish a station in which the amateur pilots, the flying farmers, and the commercal pilots are all interested, because there is a gap of almost 500 miles without reliable weather reports. It would seem to me that the Weather Bureau and the Department of Commerce should not have their hands tied to the extent that they could not close a station which is, in a certain sense, a duplication of another station, and use that saving either for the benefit of the Treasury or establishing a new station where needed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from South Dakota that that, of course, is one of the reasons why nothing was written into this bill as a mandate to prevent the closing of stations. As I indicated, it is rather difficult to satisfy everyone. It was the intention of the committee, certainly, to permit the essential weather stations to remain open, and to provide adequate funds with which to operate them. Though there may be some duplication, certainly there is nothing in the bill that would prevent the opening up of a new station. Generally speaking, the appropriation is for the purpose of maintaining the present Weather Bureau system.

Mr. CASE. Or for the purpose of avoiding the requirement that stations shall be closed. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. CASE. It would be possible for them to remain open, in case they should be kept open.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment, under the subhead "General Provisions—Department of Commerce," on page 52, after line 19, has been ordered to be passed over.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee which is in order.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—Corporations—Inland Waterways Corporation," on page 54, line 9, after the word "exceed", strike out "$240,000" and insert "$480,000", and in line 10, after the word "exceed", strike out "$6,000" and insert "$12,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—General Provisions," on page 56, after line 15, to insert:

> SEC. 503. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay any expenses incident to or in connection with, participation in the International Materials Conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think I should request that there be stated an amendment which is proposed by members of the Appropriations Committee in place of the amendment which I had intended to offer on behalf of the committee, denying funds to the United Nations organization in case of the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. I ask that that amendment be stated. It is offered, following advance notice, under a motion to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire should be informed that it is the amendment on page 56, following line 15, that is before the Senate, not the amendment to which the Senator is referring. The question is on the pending amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire may now proceed to discuss the amendment in which he is concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment dated June 2, 1953, lettered A, which is offered following 1 day's advance notice. We are offering it as a substitute for the amendment which was to be proposed, of which notice was given, and which would have withdrawn funds from the United Nations in the event of the admission of Communist China to membership in that organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert:

> It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I was happy to join my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, and others, in the offering the substitute amendment. I happen to be 1 of 4 Senators who voted in committee against the so-called Dirksen amendment. I opposed the amendment because I felt that it infringed upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as well as upon the prerogatives of the President.

Mr. President, while I am opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, it is my sincere belief that the Congress should attack this problem in a direct manner. It is unthinkable that Red China, labeled an aggressor by the United Nations, would be admitted to membership in that international body. As a matter of fact, as long as the United States retains its membership in the

United Nations, we are capable of blocking the admission of Red China through our veto power on the Security Council. Be that as it may, Mr. President, if by some evil chance Red China ever should be admitted to the United Nations then this country should at least walk out of the front entrance, rather than duck out through a side door. We should stand up and let the world know why we are leaving, rather than deal the organization a death blow by the indirect method of cutting off its operating funds. In denying Red China—an aggressor—recognition among the family of sovereign nations, we must attack the problem in a cooperative and affirmative manner, rather than try to do it by beating our allies over the head with our moneybags. I repeat, Mr. President—I am happy that the so-called Dirksen amendment is being withdrawn and the substitute offered in its place. This substitute amendment is identical, as has been stated by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], with the so-called McClellan resolution which was unanimously adopted by this body in January of 1951.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator. I may say, Mr. President, that before the Senate acts on this amendment, I should like to withdraw the committee amendment on page 6, beginning in line 19, ending on page 7, line 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have—and I think that, for the good of the American people and the free world, we should have—a record vote on the amendment last stated to show the American people how we stand on the question. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BRIDGES. I will certainly yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I desire to obtain the floor for a moment, when the Senator from New Hampshire concludes. I thought he had concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. Before yielding the floor, Mr. President, I would say that this amendment is identical, with the exception of 1 or 2 words, with a resolution offered 2 years ago by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], on which he obtained a unanimous vote in the United States Senate. I respect and honor the Senator from Arkansas for what he did at that time. I think he set an excellent example, one which should be followed now, and which I trust will be followed. I believe action on this amendment will be completely bipartisan.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The only difference in the language of the two amendments is that one provided for action by the Senate, the other for action by the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I desire to inquire whether the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire has been discussed and approved at the White House. Or does the Senator care to answer that question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; it was discussed and approved. It has the full endorsement of the President.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before we vote I wish to say that I supported the original proposal reported by the Appropriations Committee. That proposal or amendment has now been withdrawn. It provided that, in the event the Government of Red China or any aggressor nation should be admitted to the United Nations, our contribution and appropriations in support of that organization would immediately cease.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that notwithstanding the fact that that amendment has been withdrawn—possibly at the urgent request of the President of the United States—it still expresses my sentiment. I oppose our continuing to support the United Nations if its membership is to be loaded down with Communist aggressors.

Mr. President, as has been stated, this amendment just offered is identical, word for word, with the resolution which I introduced on January 16, 1951, and which was adopted by the Senate, by a vote of 91 to 0, on the 23d day of January 1951.

It declared it to be the sense of the Senate that the Red Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations. At that time, Mr. President, I said, and I repeat today, that if Red China should now be admitted to the United Nations, that would be an infamous day in the history of the world. If and when that should occur, when Red China walks in America should walk out.

Mr. President, though I should prefer to support the original amendment which came from the Appropriations Committee, I think it well that the Congress, the Senate of the 83d Congress, go on record reaffirming the action taken by the Senate of the 82d Congress. Let us renew the warning. Let us renew it, not only to our allies and to the United Nations but also to the leaders of this country, so that they may know, in future negotiations and in the conduct of future relations not only with our allies but in negotiations now in process with our enemies, that the Congress and the American people do not intend to dignify and reward aggression, or to honor and exalt the aggressor. We must not tolerate appeasement of this sort, by taking aggressors into the family of nations on the same plane of honor and decency as that upon which the United Nations organization was set up, to carry out the great mission of peace and security that was committed to it.

I do not believe that mission can be achieved nor that the integrity of the United Nations can be preserved by admitting aggressor nations to membership in it. Therefore, Mr. President, I am glad to vote for this amendment, and I trust that we shall have again a unanimous vote in support of it. I cannot conceive that any patriotic, loyal American would oppose it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was looking for the original resolution which the distinguished Senator introduced. It is my recollection that the resolution was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; the Senator is mistaken. On the day I offered the resolution, which was identical with the amendment now pending, I submitted three resolutions. The first one was Senate Resolution 35, which declared it to be the sense of this body that the United Nations should declare Red China an aggressor. That resolution was agreed to by unanimous consent.

The second resolution was Senate Resolution 36, which was the same as the amendment we are now considering. After modification it was adopted in the identical language of the pending amendment. It provided that it was the sense of the Senate that the Red China Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations.

The third resolution dealt with a blockade of China. It was Senate Resolution 37, which was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, but no action was ever taken on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was under the impression that the resolution was considered by the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was not referred to the committee. It was submitted on the 16th of January and remained on the table until January the 23d, at which time it was considered and agreed to. It had been slightly modified. As it was agreed to it read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

Mr. President, that language is identical with that of the amendment now being considered, save and except that where the word "Senate" appears the amendment contains the word "Congress."

I urge that the pending amendment be adopted immediately and unanimously by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire for himself and other Senators, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following:

It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRK-

SEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] would each vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—76

Aiken	Capehart	Douglas
Barrett	Carlson	Duff
Beall	Case	Dworshak
Bennett	Chavez	Eastland
Bridges	Clements	Ellender
Bush	Cooper	Ferguson
Butler, Md.	Cordon	Flanders
Byrd	Daniel	George
Gore	Kilgore	Robertson
Green	Knowland	Russell
Griswold	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Hayden	Langer	Schoeppel
Hendrickson	Lehman	Smathers
Hickenlooper	Malone	Smith, Maine
Hill	Mansfield	Smith, N. J.
Hoey	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Holland	Maybank	Sparkman
Humphrey	McClellan	Stennis
Jackson	Millikin	Symington
Jenner	Monroney	Thye
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Watkins
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Wiley
Johnston, S. C.	Neely	Williams
Kefauver	Pastore	Young
Kennedy	Payne	
Kerr	Purtell	

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson	Goldwater	McCarthy
Bricker	Hennings	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Potter
Dirksen	Ives	Taft
Frear	Long	Tobey
Fulbright	Magnuson	Welker
Gillette	McCarran	

So the amendment offered by Mr. BRIDGES and other Senators was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I understand that the clerk's record shows that the amendment on page 6, line 19, in which the amount reported by the Senate committee is shown as $29,614,787, was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 6, line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should now like to call up the amendment on page 25, section 202, which was passed over. The amendment is a simple one, and I think that if Senators understand it, they will agree to it. The amendment appropriates not to exceed $1 million for general administration, general legal activities, and United States attorneys and marshals.

The amendment also sets minimum and maximum limits to the pay of United States attorneys and assistant United States attorneys. The maximum limits are raised, contingent upon United States attorneys and their assistants working full time.

As will be noticed, a higher leeway was requested in which to operate, but the Senate committee felt that a maximum of $15,000 was as high as we should go. I believe the amendment is a rather simple one, and I hope there will be no opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 25, beginning on line 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice the following provision in the last sentence of section 202, which has just been adopted:

That the maximum of $12,000 shall only apply to the chief assistant United States attorney in each office.

Does that mean in each district, or in each separate office that is maintained within a district?

Mr. BRIDGES. In each United States attorney's district.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would there be only one chief assistant in a complete district?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The United States attorney may have other assistants subject to him, but only one assistant would be the chief assistant, who could receive the maximum.

Mr. President, I now call up the amendment designated "5-28-53-F," which has to do with the appointment and removal of United States deputy marshals. This is an amendment to section 209.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, line 6, it is proposed to insert a new section, section 209, as follows:

SEC. 209. Section 542 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 542. Appointment and tenure of deputies and assistants.

"The Attorney General may authorize any United States marshal to appoint deputies and clerical assistants. Any person determined by the marshal to be qualified for appointment to the position of deputy marshal shall become eligible for such appointment upon passing such suitable noncompetitive examination as may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. Deputy marshals shall be subject to removal by the marshal pursuant to civil-service regulations, except that with the approval of the Attorney General and without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations, a deputy marshal may be removed by the marshal under whom he serves at any time within 60 days after such marshal has taken the oath of office and entered upon his duties."

Notwithstanding the provisions of the last sentence of section 542 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended, deputy marshals in office on the date of enactment of this act shall be subject to removal at any time prior to the expiration of 60 days after the date of enactment of this act by the United States marshal under whom they serve, with the approval of the Attorney General and without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations.

Section 541 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) Upon the expiration of the term of office of a marshal who at the time of his appointment as marshal was serving as a deputy marshal, such marshal shall, upon application therefor made within 30 days after expiration of his term as marshal, be restored to the position of deputy marshal."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I make a point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. A motion has previously been entered to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order. A motion to suspend the rule has already been entered.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to say a few words on this proposed amendment. It would do three things relative to the United States marshals:

First, in the case of deputies to be appointed, they would be compelled to take a noncompetitive examination, and would be subject to removal by the marshal, pursuant to civil-service regulations, except that a deputy marshal could be removed with the approval of the Attorney General at any time within 60 days after the marshal had taken the oath of office.

Second, any deputy marshal holding office on the effective date of this act

could be removed at any time prior to the expiration of 60 days after the date of the enactment of the act, without regard to civil-service regulations.

Third, any deputy marshal who had been promoted to marshal, upon being replaced in that particular position, would, upon his own application, within 30 days, be restored to the position of deputy marshal.

Mr. MONRONEY rose.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall not pretend to the Senator from Oklahoma or to any other Senator that this amendment does anything other than what the language provides. There is nothing concealed in it. It will allow the Department of Justice to have control over United States deputy marshals.

Some Senators believe that United States deputy marshals should be appointed under the civil service and should be continued in office. They believe that United States deputy marshals should be considered the same as the most sacred cow in any of the appointive branches of the Government.

Very frankly, I do not think so. I consider appointments to the position of United States deputy marshal to be political appointments. I think there should be some leeway in the case of deputy United States marshals.

I am not trying to fool anyone. As a matter of fact, the Senator from New Hampshire did not make this proposal in the committee. The Senator from New Hampshire, as chairman of the committee, is simply representing the views of the committee.

While this provision might operate to the advantage of Republicans at this time, it would be equally advantageous to Democrats at another time. It would provide for greater responsiveness among deputy United States marshals.

I hope the Senate will not waste too much time on this amendment. The issue is clear, and I think Senators are ready to vote.

I have talked with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] about this amendment. He is very much opposed to it, and intends to speak on it, but I hope we can reach a vote upon it soon.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad that, with his usual candor and honesty, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the President pro tempore of the Senate has admitted that this is an out-and-out patronage amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not say it was a patronage amendment. I said I was not coloring it. It certainly has a great deal of merit.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am inclined to disagree with the distinguished chairman of the committee. At any rate, we like to phrase our observations in genteel, parliamentary language. The political boys in Oklahoma would say that this is a "pie counter" amendment.

I do not blame the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I know that the Republicans have taken care of the board of directors of General Motors. They have taken care of the top echelon by placing them in top echelon jobs. I am sure that the county chairmen of the Republican Party are pretty much the same kind of folks as Democratic county chairmen. At the doorstep of every Republican Senator's office there must be long waiting lines of "deserving" Republicans who wish to acquire the appointments which they seem to feel they instead of the deserving Democrats who now hold such positions, should have.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Would not the Senator agree that, at least up to date, in filling various offices it has not been necessary to take any of the Communist Party or any fellow travelers?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the RECORD will not show any fellow travelers or Communist Party members appointed and confirmed by the Senate, upon the recommendation of any Democratic United States Senator. If the Senator has any such case in mind, I should be glad to have him submit it at this time to the Senate, so that we may have the name of the individual, as well as the name of the appointing officer.

Mr. CORDON. Is any greater crime involved in the appointment of those not needing confirmation than in the case of those who require confirmation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the distinguished Senator that the patronage so far as United States marshals are concerned has already been taken by the Republican Members of the Senate. Democratic United States attorneys are rapidly being replaced with "deserving" Republicans, although some of the outstanding United States attorneys still have a 3-year term to run. However, the demand has been made for their resignations, and such positions are being filled with "deserving" Republicans.

I believe that when we ride roughshod over the veterans' preference, as is now guaranteed in this amendment in the case of deputy United States marshals, and also in the case of clerks in the marshals' offices, we are setting a pattern and precedent which I believe is destructive of the civil service.

Practically all the applications for jobs that I know of in the office of deputy United States marshal go through with the regular 10-percent credit given to disabled veterans. A 5-percent credit is given to those who are war veterans but not disabled. If they are disabled and make a grade of only 70, they go to the top of the list, under the Democratic type of civil service and the methods heretofore applied in filling positions of deputy United States marshals and clerical positions.

If I read this amendment correctly—and I should be very happy to have the chairman of the committee correct me—all the veterans' preference rights are swept overboard in the interest of deserving county chairmen and the Republican faithful. There is no guaranty whatsoever of veterans' preference rights, which have obtained with reference to the filling of such positions in the past.

I do not believe that the Senate is ready to kick overboard the civil-service laws, and the veterans' preferences which were carefully written into law just as the boys were beginning to return from the European theater and the Pacific theater.

I do not believe the Senate is ready to go back to a political patronage system, regardless of the demands of county chairmen and others who would like to have these lower-paid jobs, now that the "millionaire type" of constituency has been taken care of.

I do not believe that the Senate is ready to do violence to veterans' preference rights.

In my experience most of the men who have gone into positions as deputy United States marshals or into clerical positions have had to qualify under the Veterans' Preference Act.

When any job becomes open it is subject to that act, and certainly cannot be filled by a nonveteran if a disabled veteran is applying for the position. Everyone knows that you cannot skip over a disabled veteran, or a veteran who is not disabled, and appoint a nonveteran from the list of eligibles on the Civil Service register.

So a very simple issue is involved. Do we want to deny to veterans the rights heretofore accorded them by law, to preference in these jobs, or do we want to fill the positions strictly on the basis of the recommendation of local political leaders?

This amendment is important, because it is one of the four patronage amendments contained in the bill. When we finish with this amendment, we shall have to consider three others which are also designed to relieve the stress and strain on Republican Senators and Representatives in connection with applications for these lower-paying jobs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that this amendment might be termed a "pass the pork, pappy" amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I invite attention to some very interesting language in the amendment:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of the last sentence of section 542 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended, deputy marshals in office on the date of enactment of this act shall be subject to removal at any time prior to the expiration of 60 days after the date of enactment of this act by the United States marshal under whom they serve, with the approval of the Attorney General and without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations.

Any one or all of the clerks or deputies may be fired without cause, simply because deserving Republicans want these positions, notwithstanding the fact that many of the present holders of the positions have rendered a great many years of faithful service.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator aware that in 1921 a general "ripper" act was

passed which authorized the heads of departments to reorganize their departments without regard to the civil service?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not recall.

Mr. KILGORE. At this time we are doing it piecemeal by riders on appropriation bills.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. This proposal, which would release deputy United States marshals and clerks from civil-service requirements, would throw such positions open to patronage, without regard to veterans' preference or the standing of the individuals on the register.

Such a proposal has been consistently defeated in the Congress by Democratic administrations. If one will consult the RECORD, I believe it will be found that those on this side of the aisle have voted consistently not to throw these positions onto the patronage counter. Many Democrats have consistently fought against retreat from the career service. When we start the retreat under a new administration, we are setting a time bomb which will destroy the merit system of civil service.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for another question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that in 1933 another ripper bill was passed? I do not know what happened in the State of Oklahoma, but in the State of West Virginia one of the United States marshals, who was a brother of the present Republican National Committeeman, held office until the end of his 4-year commission. No change was made in his case. In the last session of Congress and in previous sessions bills were debated on the floor of the Senate to take deputy marshals out of civil service, and they were overwhelmingly defeated on three different occasions. Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct; and a good portion of the votes to defeat such proposed legislation came from the Republican side of the aisle. Of course the issue may be on the other foot today. Perhaps the patronage problem facing Senators is so great that they would like to forget about the advantages of an integrated service of career employees in the marshal's office. If Senators are at all concerned with preserving veterans' preference, for men who have served their country, they will certainly vote against the adoption of the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to clarify the parliamentary situation with the distinguished chairman of the committee. I ask that the amendments pertaining to section 209, on page 27, beginning on line 6, and going over to page 28, line 15, be considered en bloc.

Due to a misunderstanding in the way the amendments were reported, I find that inadvertently, in the compilation of the RECORD, the latter part of the amendment was adopted yesterday, although an agreement had been entered into that the so-called United States marshal amendments would be passed over until the end of the bill.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it necessary to ask unanimous consent that the amendments pertaining to section 209, United States marshals, which were all contained in one printed amendment, and appear on page 27, line 6, through page 28, line 15, be considered as one amendment, and that the action taken yesterday in the Senate by which a portion of the amendment was adopted, be vacated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will inform the Senator from Oklahoma that no part of the amendment has been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 5888. After I raised the point, I said:

> Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, is not this one of the amendments which was to be passed over?

I was referring to United States marshals, section 209.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said. "Yes."

> The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The amendment was then split and there was read by the clerk, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the latter portion of the amendment appearing on page 27 of the bill, beginning at line 23.

The RECORD shows that that portion of the amendment was agreed to.

The same is true with reference to the amendment on page 28, lines 7 to 15.

Mr. BRIDGES. If there is any question about it the committee would have no objection to consider as one amendment the language of section 209, from page 27, line 6, through line 15 on page 28, because the language pertains to one matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be considered in the form requested by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. And the reported action of yesterday will be declared vacated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed by the parliamentarian that the RECORD is in error in that respect, and that no action was taken upon that portion of the amendment. The action taken was actually on page 25.

Mr. MONRONEY. In closing, Mr. President, I ask the Senate not to retreat from the guaranteed veterans' benefits and rights of our disabled veterans to have first chance at these positions of clerks and deputy United States marshals, but to be fair with regard to veterans' preference, and the employment of veterans, both disabled and not disabled, as clerks and deputy United States marshals throughout the country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wished to make one observation. A year ago, when we considered the reorganization plan for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, it was deemed advisable by a majority of this body to place under civil service the position of collector of internal revenue, which I believe to be a policy-forming position. Now it is proposed to take the little fellow, who is a clerk, from under civil service. To be consistent, Mr. President, if we place internal-revenue collectors, who are at the head of an office which is much larger than that of a marshal's office, under civil service, certainly clerks and marshals should also be placed under civil service.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his observation. Certainly no one can consider the job of deputy United States marshal a policy-making job, and certainly we do not want to turn over the job of enforcing the decision of our Federal courts—and thus turning back the clock for 20 years— to any political hack who may be recommended for the job. It is too important a job, and we should not go backward.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he does not think action such as is proposed completely defeats the purpose of the civil service, which is the sole guaranty of job tenure and the protection of career employees? In other words, does not the amendment provide a political tool whereby the civil service can be bypassed instead of remaining what it was intended to be, namely, an arrangement under which we could build up career employees in the Government and increase the efficiency of the Government?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from West Virginia is entirely correct. The promise of more efficient performance from Government employees, made by the Republican Party in its campaign, is going to fall flat on its face; and we now see the dagger of fear pointing at two million career employees, who see the new administration, under a Republican-controlled Congress, trying to take away the hard-won rights of the career employees in Government.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the able chairman of the Appropriations Committee was very candid in his statement in respect to what the amendment would do, and I think the able Senator from Oklahoma has been equally candid. He wants to retain all Democrats in these jobs. I think the issue is a very clear-cut one.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been quite impressed with the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma in some respects. I was wondering whether the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire would accept a modification of his amendment which would make it nonapplicable to every employee who was appointed on merit after passing an examination, and to make the amendment applicable only to those persons who were blanketed in without going through that process?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that would be very fair. I think we should protect the merit system. I would be very glad to restrict my amendment to those employees who were blanketed in without examination. I accept the modification.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not true that in the last days of the New Deal thousands of persons were put on the Federal payroll and later blanketed into civil service, without examination?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, it is.

Mr. WATKINS. Was not the purpose of that move, and is not the purpose of the move now being made in an attempt to block this matter, to make the spoils system permanent insofar as the Democrats are concerned?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. President, we would perfect the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. This amendment is an entirely new one. Since it would write legislation into an appropriation bill, 24 hours' notice would have to be given before the action proposed could be taken.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is my understanding that notice was given in the case of the amendment. We have here a modification of the amendment; the modification has been accepted by the proponent of the amendment. So now we are faced with the same amendment, but with a modification.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it permissible to change the entire text of the amendment, although the new text is not printed and is not available in the Senate Chamber?

So far as I know, no member of the Senate has seen the changed amendment or knows what is running through the mind of the distinguished majority whip or through the mind of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before the Chair rules, I modify my amendment as follows:

On page 28, after line 15, insert:

"The amendments provided in section 209 of this act shall not apply to those employees who derived civil-service status by competitive examination."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I rise to make a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This amendment is not the original amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. He is now trying to amend a committee amendment, on the floor of the Senate, without giving the required 24 hours' notice.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the committee directed me, as the chairman of the committee, to offer the amendment. The chairman of the committee submitted the amendment, and gave notice of intention to move to suspend the rule.

Unquestionably when the committee gave the chairman of the committee authority to offer the amendment, the committee authorized and directed the chairman of the committee to offer the amendment as his own amendment. Under the circumstances, certainly I have the privilege of speaking for the committee, for the committee authorized me to make such changes as would protect the amendment.

I point to the fact that the amendment is entitled "amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BRIDGES to the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes." In the caption of the amendment there is no statement to the effect that the Appropriations Committee authorized and directed me to offer the amendment. I offer the amendment myself.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I still insist on the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish the record to be clear. First, let me ask whether the committee discussed the amendment at all.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator from South Carolina refers to the additional words I have just stated, I may say the committee has not met and considered those words.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee has not discussed those words in any way whatsoever; is that the case?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, the committee considered the amendment, and was in accord with the amendment, and directed me to offer the amendment. But I have not had an opportunity to discuss with the committee the additional words.

As the proponent of the original amendment, even though it was offered by direction of the committee, I believe I have a right to modify the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to be heard further on the point of order.

The question is whether a committee amendment, offered as such, and not appearing in the printed bill, is subject to modification by one member of the committee, even though he be the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Furthermore, the point of order goes to the required 24 hours' notice in the case of intention to move to suspend the rule, in order to make in order an amendment proposing the inclusion of legislation in an appropriation bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, in this case 24 hours' notice is required, because of the change proposed to be made in the amendment.

For both reasons, I believe the modification of the amendment is clearly out of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the committee itself proposed that the words we find set forth at this point in the bill be included as part of the bill. I understand that a point of order was raised against that proposal, and in effect those words were stricken out or rejected.

Under the rule, therefore, the chairman of the committee in his own name offered the amendment as his own amendment. It was then a completely de novo amendment. The Senator from New Hampshire offers the amendment. He has given notice of an intention to move to suspend the rule. He has also asked to modify his amendment.

I understand that since time immemorial, the author of an amendment has had the right to accept modification of his own amendment. I understand that is the parliamentary situation.

This matter becomes important because in voting on a motion to suspend the rule, the Senate might vote in an entirely different way if, as a result of the amendment, as proposed, the merit system would be maintained, and if the continued civil-service status of only those who had been blanketed in, without regard to the merit system, were the issue.

It seems to me that at least that point should be clarified, namely, whether the Senator from New Hampshire—the item having been knocked out of the bill on a point of order—has a right to modify his amendment prior to the taking of the vote on the motion to suspend the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule, so as to make it possible for the Senate to consider the amendment the Senator from New Hampshire has proposed to offer.

The Senator from California is correct when he states that the committee amendment has been ruled out, on a point of order.

However, since the question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule, in order to make it possible to consider the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire, the amendment itself is not at this time before the Senate.

Therefore, under the circumstances the vote will be on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule.

The Senator from New Hampshire could indicate to the Senate that after the rule is suspended, if it is, and if his amendment then is in order, he will modify his amendment.

But the question now before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to say that the Senate is preparing to vote on a matter which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has held hearings many times. In the committee both the Republican Members and the Democratic Members have been unanimous in reaching the conclusion that the deputy marshals of the United States should continue under civil service. That question has been before us many times in recent years, and Senators on both sides of the aisle have voted almost unanimously to keep the deputy marshals under the civil service.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is exactly what the amendment I seek to have added to the bill would provide, namely, that those who are entitled to civil-service status shall be protected, but that those who were politically blanketed in will not be protected.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I call attention to the fact that the present question is on agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule. If the rule is suspended, then the amendment the committee has proposed will first come before the Senate. Thereafter, amendments could be offered to that amendment. That is in accordance with the rule.

However, the first vote to be taken will be on the question of agreeing to the motion to suspend the rule.

I, for one, do not believe we should vote to suspend the rule, in order to begin to break down the civil-service system. Some of those who are under civil service at this time have had 25 or more years of service under the civil-service system. This is a deliberate attempt to remove them from the civil service.

I warn my colleagues and I warn the civil-service workers of the United States that this is only the first step; and if it is approved, we shall be asked to remove other workers from under the merit system. That attempt will be made because of a desire to play politics. So we should let them know just what this move amounts to.

I am one who believes that we should have a civil-service merit system in the United States Government. When Senators vote, let them consider the effect of their votes upon the veterans who were promised protection from political influence when serving their Government. Will it be said that he cannot be approved until the matter comes to the Congress for political approval? Was this young American boy asked his political preference when directed to fight for this Nation? Some of them are in these positions now because they are disabled World War veterans. Will Senators vote to create a situation under which they can be tossed out to make a job for some politician? Mr. President, we had as well face the facts. This matter ought to be studied thoroughly in the committee which deals with civil-service matters. I want it plainly understood that, so far as I am concerned, I am not in favor of breaking down our merit system in the United States Government.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to suspend the rules.

Mr. MONRONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] would each vote "yea."

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] was paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

If present and voting the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay." The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT,] the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If present and voting the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Flanders	Payne
Bennett	Griswold	Potter
Bridges	Hendrickson	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jenner	Schoeppel
Carlson	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Case	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Langer	Thye
Cordon	Malone	Watkins
Duff	Martin	Wiley
Dworshak	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Mundt	

NAYS—36

Chavez	Holland	Maybank
Clements	Humphrey	McClellan
Daniel	Jackson	Monroney
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
George	Kefauver	Robertson
Gore	Kennedy	Smathers
Green	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	Kilgore	Sparkman
Hill	Lehman	Stennis
Hoey	Mansfield	Symington

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Fulbright	McCarthy
Barrett	Gillette	Murray
Beall	Goldwater	Russell
Bricker	Hennings	Taft
Bush	Hunt	Tobey
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Welker
Byrd	Long	Young
Dirksen	Magnuson	
Frear	McCarran	

So Mr. BRIDGES' motion to suspend the rules was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my motion which is at the clerk's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The CHIEF CLERK. Mr. MUNDT moves to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the amendment on page 5, line 12, of the bill, providing for the acquisition of buildings abroad.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am asking that the Senate reconsider the vote which was cast on last Monday on a committee amendment, found on page 5 of the bill, because in reading the RECORD and in analyzing the vote, it occurred to me that many Senators, who were not on the floor during the debate, voted, I am sure, in contradiction to their normal inclinations as members of the economy bloc, because, if there ever was an economy amendment offered by the committee, it is the amendment on page 5 of the bill which provides that not to

exceed $4 million of our foreign credits may be made available for the purpose of building suitable housing for American diplomats in our Embassies abroad, thus saving us a very sizable cost of annual rental which it is now necessary to pay in foreign capitals where we do not have our own property.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the amount requested is less than one-half of 1 percent of the total amount available to us as credits. These credits are being hoarded in various sections of the world. After the war, we sold surplus property to foreign nations. By executive agreement it was stipulated that the money could be spent for the exchange of students, and it can be spent for the acquisition of buildings for which we are now paying excessive rentals.

By agreeing to the amendment the Senate would certainly be acting in the interest of economy. I notice that many of my good friends in the Senate who normally vote for an economy measure, voted on this particular occasion against that economy impulse, and I thought it would be well to have a clear-cut explanation, while many Senators are present, so that, at least, they would be sure about the issue involved in this particular amendment.

I should like to point out where the buildings are to be constructed.

An office building and principal officers' residence are to be constructed at Asuncion, estimated to cost $315,000.

An office building and principal officers' residence is to be constructed at Tangier, the estimated cost of which is $500,000.

Office buildings and staff housing for consular posts on the United States border are to be constructed in Mexico, at an estimated cost of $650,000.

An office building is to be constructed in Helsinki at an estimated cost of $600,000.

An office building is to be constructed in The Hague at an estimated cost of $525,000.

An office building and staff housing are to be constructed in New Delhi at an estimated cost of $1 million.

Staff housing is to be constructed in Bangkok at an estimated cost of $60,000.

An office building is to be constructed in Djakarta at an estimated cost of $350,000.

These projects would total $4 million.

Mr. President, not one single dime of the $4 million comes out of the United States Treasury; not one single dime is being appropriated in this bill for this purpose. It is provided that money now being hoarded shall be available for the construction of these buildings, thus saving the rental charge on housing in the locations which I have mentioned and enabling us to get some good out of our foreign credits before they entirely disappear.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senator from South Dakota is presenting this matter, and I hope the Senate will reconsider its action of last Monday. I say that especially because I was necessarily absent from the Senate last Monday and was unable to cast my vote.

I desire to say to the Senator from South Dakota and to the Senate, Mr. President, that I am sure anyone who has seen the situation abroad will agree with me that this is one place, and about the only place of which I know, where the American people will be getting something back for money they have spent. It comes from funds which, if not used in this way and in other ways available to us, will be dissipated and lost and we will get nothing.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there is no question about that. We shall have a generous impulse some day and give all the money away, unless we use it at this time for the purpose which I have described.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, here is an opportunity to have buildings and housing which otherwise we would be paying for through the nose. It seems to me that this is a sensible provision. We hear great praise of the program with respect to the exchange of students. I think it is a very excellent program. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], has been interested in it, as has the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. One of the strongest arguments used to support that program is that in the main the money to support it comes from funds frozen abroad in local currencies, which cannot be used except for the student program and the acquisition of real estate and property which otherwise the United States Government would have to rent from local agencies.

I earnestly urge Members of the Senate to consider that the amendment does not involve the expenditure of money out of the Treasury of the United States. It is derived from credits which we already have in foreign nations and which will eventually go down the drain if we do not use them.

I think the amendment is a worthy one. It gives us something for our money. In most instances we do not get anything for the money which we spend out of the Treasury in many operations which we conduct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I was absent on Monday when the vote was cast on this particular amendment. I do not know whether there was a yea-and-nay vote——

Mr. MUNDT. There was a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. GEORGE. There must have been a misapprehension, because the money does not come out of the United States Treasury. It is from counterpart funds which we are recovering in several foreign nations. We have heretofore authorized the construction of some buildings out of the same funds. I am quite sure that if the Senate properly evaluates the question it will not vote down the amendment. I hope that the motion to reconsider will be agreed to, so that we may vote on the merits.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Georgia very much.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I gladly yield to my colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I, too, was necessarily absent from the Senate on Monday. Had I been present I certainly would have supported the amendment. I hope the motion to reconsider will be agreed to so that we can have another vote.

I should like to say with reference to one point in connection with the merits of the question that in looking through the RECORD I noticed that one objection was raised in the debate on the ground that if we construct buildings and own them we shall have to provide operation and maintenance costs for them.

The alternative is that we shall not have to rent buildings and also pay operation and maintenance costs. So, Mr. President, here is an opportunity to avoid having to pay rent in addition to operation and maintenance expenses.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank my colleague. Mr. President, I think no Senator is any more interested in the student exchange program than I am.

If I felt that the amendment would in any way impair that program, I would not support it. However, throughout the world the United States has $650 million frozen in foreign credit. We are speaking of only $4 million, which is about one-half of 1 percent. This item would not impair the student-exchange program, but would enable the United States to get something worth while, tangible, and valuable for money which would otherwise be dissipated and go down the drain.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am quite certain that the Senate was under a misapprehension with respect to these funds when the vote was taken yesterday. It was stated that some of the credit agreement funds could be used for the purchase of various items of material which are needed. I wish to refer to the amount that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has mentioned, namely, the amount of outstanding balances under credit agreements that were available for payment in foreign currencies. I have before me a statement showing that as of December 31, 1952, the total amount in all countries was $689,570,447.

I should like to point out, however, that this huge amount cannot be used by us in any particular year; withdrawals from these funds are spread over long periods

of time. For instance, in Austria, the amount is to become available over a period of years, and the last withdrawal cannot be made until 1976.

In the case of the United Kingdom, for which the greatest amount is shown on the paper I have in my hand, the use of these credits is to extend over the years, becoming liquidated in the year 2000.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The total amount in all countries that is available as of this date is only $42,909,396.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement indicating the purposes for which these funds are to be used.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS AGAINST USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES MADE AVAILABLE UNDER CREDIT AGREEMENTS, AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1952

1. BOLIVIA

(Source: Lend-lease)

A. Balance available held by Treasury. These funds were originally held for the Department's building program, but are now being used for operating expense and buildings.

2. BRAZIL

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Balance held by Department in trust for Treasury, due to heavy taxation on nonresident bank account. About $80,000 equivalent represents earned interest on deposits, which amount is being used by the Department for operating expenses. The remainder represents principal payment made specifically for a building program in Brazil.

3. COLOMBIA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Negotiations are currently under way for the payment of this small balance. Payment was delayed due to difference of opinion on appropriate exchange rate applicable to previous payments by Colombia.

4. ECUADOR

(Source: Surplus property)

A. There are no restrictions on the use of currency held by Treasury and subsequent payments by Ecuador may be used for payment of any United States expenses in Ecuador.

5. MEXICO

(Source: Lend-lease)

A. The balance due under this settlement arrangement, $3,250,000, is payable $1 million in January 1953 (payment has been made) and $750,000 each January 1954, 1955, and 1956. The Government of Mexico will still owe a balance of $6,750,000 after the above payments are made. A new settlement arrangement will be worked out at that time. Funds acquired under this agreement are available for any United States expenses in Mexico.

6. NICARAGUA

(Source: Lend-lease)

A. The foreign currency obtained under this agreement is through a settlement arrangement under which Nicaragua will pay the equivalent of $33,483.34 each quarter, January 1953 through October 1954, at which time the debt will be liquidated. These funds are available for any United States expenses in Nicaragua; however, the Department's building program has awarded contracts in excess of $400,000 and sufficient currency must be reserved to liquidate this obligation.

7. PERU

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Negotiations are currently under way for the payment of the balance of this credit. The funds received will be available for any United States expenses in Peru.

(Source: Lend-lease)

B. The Government of Peru owes the United States $2,882,910.64 under a lend-lease settlement. A settlement arrangement is being negotiated for the settlement of this credit, which will probably carry facilities for at least partial payment in foreign currency, which would be available for any United States expenses in Peru.

8. HAITI

(Source: War assets agreement)

A. Negotiations are under way for the settlement of this credit. If payment is accepted in Haitian gourdes, they would be available for any United States expenses.

9. AUSTRIA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The surplus property credit agreement is available for accelerated payments without annual limitation; $827,500 equivalent thereof has been reserved for the completion of an approved educational foundation program.

B. The war asset agreements are handled by the General Services Administration and options to accelerate payments in foreign currencies have not been exercised to date.

C. Foreign currency equivalent to $3,852,902.42 held by the Treasury were made available for the occupied area program by the Mutual Security Agency and are reserved for that purpose.

10. BELGIUM

(Source: Mutual-aid settlement)

A. The balance available under this agreement is available only for educational and building programs under the terms of the agreement. The balance outstanding for the educational program is $2,392,500, while $3,012,348 is available for buildings. The balance on hand in the Treasury was drawn under the building section of the agreement; $5 million originally established for any United States expenses has been used. Limitation $5 million per year.

11. CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Accelerated payments under the terms of this agreement have been temporarily suspended by the Czech Government. If payments are resumed, the funds received are available for any United States expenses and the annual limitation for such payments is $2 million.

12. DENMARK

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Funds available for accelerated payment under this agreement have been reserved for an approved educational program.

B. Foreign currencies equivalent to $581,655.94 held by Treasury were originally made available by the Mutual Security Agency and are reserved to meet contract payments against the building program.

C. The Mutual Security Agency made additional funds available here and the Treasury has a balance of $793,625.95 that is available for any United States expenses. Two million dollar limitation per year.

13. FINLAND

(Source: Surplus property)

A. An educational program in the amount of $1,250,000 has been approved for Finland and funds in that amount reserved. The Finland Agreement has no annual limitation and funds received thereunder are available for any United States expenses.

14. FRANCE

(Source: Surplus property)

A. One surplus property credit agreement in the total amount of $300 million provides that $15 million thereof may be used for the acquisition of property and that $10 million thereof may be paid in French currency that may be used for buildings or an educational program.

B. Due to the very bad dollar position of the French Government and through the medium of settlement arrangements, the French francs acquired for any United States expenses have ben credited to interest payments against the French agreements.

C. There is an annual limitation of $10 million in any single fiscal year applicable to all agreements combined. Ten million dollar limitation per year.

15. HUNGARY

(Source: Surplus property)

A. This agreement is available for any United States expenses in Hungary and carries an annual limitation of $3 million.

B. Accelerated payments are made by the Legation at Budapest and funds held in trust account in favor of the Treasury.

16. ITALY

(Source: Surplus property)

A. This agreement is available for any United States expenses in Italy and carries an annual (calendar year) limitation of $6 million.

17. NETHERLANDS

(Source: Surplus property)

A. This agreement is available for any United States expenses and has no annual limitation on the amount that may be drawn.

B. Accelerated payments have been made only with respect to educational foundation funds as the Treasury holds large quantities of Netherlands declared surplus by the Mutual Security Agency. No annual limitation.

18. NORWAY

(Source: Surplus property)

A. There is no annual limitation against payments under this agreement and the funds acquired are available for any United States expenses in Norway.

(Source: Lend-lease)

B. This agreement is also available for payment in Norwegian kroner which may be used for any United States expenses without annual limitation.

19. POLAND

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Accelerated payments under this agreement are available for any United States expenses in Poland with an annual limitation of $2 million.

B. Payments are requested by the Embassy at Warsaw as needed and the zlotys acquired are carried in a trust account in favor of the Treasury.

20. SPAIN

(Source: German reparations)

A. The outstanding balance under this heading is temporarily held up by the Spanish Government.

B. Funds on hand in Treasury are reserved to meet a contract for construction at Madrid.

21. SWEDEN

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Due to limited source here, the total available has been reserved for an educational program and to meet contract payments for construction in Sweden.

22. SWITZERLAND

(Source: German reparations)

A. The Inter-Allied Reparations Agency at Brussels has drawn up an agreement with the Swiss for the settlement for German external assets in the amount of 80 million Swiss francs. The agreement must be approved by the Swiss Parliament and is before that body at this time. When settlement is made, the United States share should be about 14,500,000 Swiss francs, conservatively estimated to be worth $3 million.

23. YUGOSLAVIA

(Source: Lend-lease)

A. Payment has been temporarily delayed on this agreement due to exchange-rate difficulties.

24. ICELAND

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Exchange-rate difficulties with respect to this agreement were cleared up during the last week of January. Funds are available for any United States expenses.

25. AUSTRALIA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Funds under this agreement are restricted to buildings and an educational program. Balance, $4,249,694 for an educational program and $1,241,705 for a building program.

26. NEW ZEALAND

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The original agreement was restricted to buildings and educational programs, but negotiations are under way for the extension of use of a part of the balance for any United States expenses. The balance outstanding approved for an educational program is $1,945,000.

27. SOUTH AFRICA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The balance of $50,000 in the Treasurer's account is reserved for an educational program.

28. UNITED KINGDOM

(Source: Mutual-aid settlement)

A. The balance outstanding under this settlement is, by the terms of the agreement, restricted to use for an educational program in England and to a building program in England and the colonial possessions. No annual limitation—cannot be used for operating expenses.

29. GERMANY

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The balance of $65,877,403 represents the amount due from the bulk sales of surplus property. The Department of the Army had two other types of property deliveries to Germany, known as quantitative receipts and incentive materials. It is understood that a combined settlement agreement for the three types is being negotiated at this time and that the amount thereof will probably be $200 million. The original surplus-property agreement was without annual limitation and available for any United States expenses.

B. Deutschemarks equivalent to $3,084,416.26 held by the Treasury were obtained under the information media guaranty program and are in a "blocked" account; however, $95,000 thereof are sold to the Department for operating expenses each month.

30. GREECE

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The surplus property agreement is available for any United States expenses with an annual limitation of $5 million. Limited drawings have been made against this agreement due to the large amount held by the Treasury.

B. The funds held by the Treasury were drachmae surplus to the needs of the Mutual Security Agency in Greece.

31. IRAN

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Funds acquired under this agreement are normally available for any United States expenses and have an annual limitation of $3 million. However, options to accelerate under this agreement have not been exercised due to the very bad political and economic situation in Iran over the past year and a half.

32. IRAQ

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Five hundred sixty thousand dollars of the balance held by the Treasury in Iraq has been reserved for an approved educational program. The balance is available for any United States expenses.

33. ISRAEL

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Funds on hand in the Treasury are available for any United States expenses.

34. JORDAN

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Balance available for any United States expenses.

35. LEBANON

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Settlement of this agreement has been accomplished in January and funds are available for any United States expenses.

36. TURKEY

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Funds under this agreement are available for any United States expenses. Turkey has made annual United States dollar payments early each year and it is expected the balance will be used prior to June 30, 1953.

37. INDIA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. While payments under this agreement are permissible, the options have not been exercised due to large amount held by the Treasury.

B. The balance shown in Treasury account represents proceeds from surplus property.

C. Large amounts held in a second account of the Treasury have been sold to the Department and this source will be exhausted before June 30, 1953.

38. CEYLON

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The funds in the Treasury are reserved for an approved educational program.

39. EGYPT

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The funds held by the Treasury are available for any United States expenses in Egypt; $723,500 thereof have been reserved for an approved educational program.

40. ETHIOPIA

(Source: Lend lease)

A. The balance in this account is reserved for contract payments for buildings.

41. LIBERIA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The balance in this account is reserved for contract payments for buildings.

42. PAKISTAN

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The balance in the Treasurer's account is available for any United States expenses in Pakistan.

B. Treasury has sold considerable currency to the Department from another account in this area. Balance not available.

43. BURMA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Payments under this agreement are available for any United States expenses and may not exceed 75 percent of the unpaid balance.

44. CHINA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. No payments under this agreement since Nationalist Government left China.

45. INDONESIA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Funds acquired under this agreement are available for any United States expenses and without annual limitation. The agreement provides that $7 million may be used for an educational program and $1,300,000 for buildings both subject to change by negotiations.

46. JAPAN

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The surplus property settlement was not included in the peace treaty, but was left for subsequent settlement. Accelerated payments thereunder will be required in about 90 days. OFD is looking into this. An educational agreement has been approved for $4,750,000 of which a balance of $4,314,273 is outstanding.

47. KOREA

(Source: Surplus property)

A. This agreement is available for any United States expenses without annual limitation. The annual interest payment is also made in Korean won which has provided ample currency for the Department's needs until this year.

48. PHILIPPINES

(Source: Surplus property)

A. The balance under this agreement is restricted for use by educational foundation and for buildings. The balance outstanding for the approved educational program is $1 million, while the balance for buildings is $490,043.

49. THAILAND

(Source: Surplus property)

A. Funds acquired under this agreement are available for any United States expenses with an annual limit of $1 million. An educational program was approved for $1 million of which $580,000 is still outstanding.

50.

All war asset agreements shown in the availability statement are handled by the General Services Administration and no accelerated payments thereunder have been accomplished to date.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in Bolivia, these funds were originally held for the Department's building program, but are now being used for operating expense and buildings.

In practically every country there is a limitation placed on the use of these funds. For instance, in France, one surplus property credit agreement provides that $15 million may be used for the acquisition of property, and that $10 million thereof may be paid in French currency that may be used for buildings or an educational program. The expenditures of such funds in foreign countries are limited along the lines I have just indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement listing the outstanding balances under credit agreements available for payments in foreign currencies as of December 31, 1952, excluding foreign aid counterpart funds.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Outstanding balances under credit agreements available for payments in foreign currencies Dec. 31, 1952 (excludes foreign aid counterpart)

	Surplus property	Lend-lease	War assets	Reparations	Foreign currencies held by Treasury		Country totals
					Treasurer's accounts	U. S. D. O. accounts	
American Republics:							
Bolivia					$37,796		$37,796
Brazil 002						$529,771	529,771
Colombia	$22,334						22,334
Ecuador	166,529				33,242	16,165	215,936
Haiti			$150,501				150,501
Mexico		$3,250,000			229,020		3,479,020
Nicaragua		267,866			208,763		476,629
Peru	110,976						110,976
European:							
Austria	7,257,050		1,656,996		,108,843		13,022,889
Belgium	5,404,848				164,274		5,569,122
Czechoslovakia	4,989,063					5,000	4,994,063
Denmark	695,321				,375,252		2,070,573
Finland	16,471,164		4,424,585		69,722		20,965,471
France	57,438,000		4,316,556		2,083,832	2,237,341	66,075,729
Hungary	13,598,624					60	13,598,684
Italy	127,038,109				677		127,038,786
Netherlands	15,352,559		454,684		5,610,724		21,417,967
Norway	3,054,248	5,900,000	305,763		153,466		9,413,477
Poland	34,194,891					68,000	34,262,891
Spain				$270,387	984,442	56,035	1,310,864
Sweden	931,352				51,741		983,093
Switzerland				3,000,000			3,000,000
Yugoslavia		260,635			5,324		265,959
Iceland	358,483				41,438		399,921
Australia	5,491,399				24		5,491,423
New Zealand	3,553,273				60,000		3,613,273
Union of South Africa					50,000		50,000
United Kingdom	30,345,298						30,345,298
Germany	65,877,403				3,088,582		68,965,985
Near and Middle East-Africa:							
Greece	50,086,969				8,690,571		58,777,540
Iran	25,304,541						25,304,541
Iraq					806,774		806,774
Israel					81,875		81,875
Jordan					187,428		187,428
Lebanon	417,260						417,260
Turkey	719,138						719,138
India	10,792,424				5,576,835		16,369,259
Ceylon					364,124		364,124
Egypt					1,728,242		1,728,242
Ethiopia		103,900					103,900
Liberia	65,330						65,330
Pakistan					2,485,647		2,485,647
Far East:							
Burma	3,439,935						3,439,935
China	46,079,237						46,079,237
Indonesia	59,243,480				172,676		59,416,156
Japan	7,849,735				1,431,895		9,281,630
Korea	20,950,019					89,833	21,039,852
Philippines	1,490,043		820,729				2,310,772
Thailand	2,689,414					23,962	2,713,376
Grand total	621,478,449	9,782,401	12,129,814	3,270,387	39,883,229	3,026,167	689,570,447
Available now					42,909,396		

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of Federal building projects to be financed under the certification procedure requested for the fiscal year 1954.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

List of FBO projects to be financed under the certification procedure requested for fiscal year 1954

Location	Type of building	Estimated cost
Asuncion	Office building and principal officers residence.	[1] $315,000
Tangier	do	500,000
Mexico	Office building and staff housing.	650,000
Helsinki	Office building	600,000
The Hague	do	525,000
New Delhi	Office building and staff housing.	1,000,000
Bangkok	Officer housing	60,000
Djakarta	Office building	350,000
Total		[2] 4,000,000

[1] Balance required ($200,000) to be supplied out of dollar reserves.

[2] Probably will be met by lend-lease and surplus property credits.

No sewage; no water system.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am very happy the Senator from South Dakota has brought this matter to the attention of the Senate. I shall make a confession. I was one of the Senators who came to the Senate floor late, just previous to the vote on this amendment, and I certainly was under the impression that the funds we were striking out were funds which ultimately would have to be paid by the taxpayers of this country.

The Senator's explanation has placed an entirely different light on the situation. I am certainly happy that he has brought up the matter, because I can now see very quickly that unless we utilize these funds, which I know will be judiciously used in the construction program, it will be necessary to use money voted out of the United States Treasury if it is desired to have the improvements sought to be made in foreign countries.

Mr. MUNDT. Finding the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] among those who voted in the negative, and remembering his record for economy, were among the reasons that impelled me to submit the motion to reconsider. I knew that the Senator from Kansas, who has been attending a committee meeting, coming into the Chamber late and seeing an opportunity to eliminate practically $4 million from the bill, thinking that that was probably a way to economize, voted against the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure that those who voted against the amendment under a misapprehension are delighted to have the explanation made by the Senator from South Dakota. However, their action was not the fault of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who explained the amendment exactly as the Senator from South Dakota is now doing.

My misapprehension arose from the fact that so many Senators on the other side of the aisle were against the amendment. Even some who had heard the Senator from New Hampshire explain the proposition voted in the negative.

However, I believe that they did not understand the intent of the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the vote can be explained by the fact that most Republican Senators are so diligent in their committee work that they were not on the floor to hear the explanation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I tried to assist the Senator from New Hampshire by stating practically what the Senator from South Dakota has stated. I told the Senate that I had seen with my own eyes how buildings had been obtained in Europe with this class of funds, and how we were buying them on a high market. I called attention to the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent by this Government in Argentina in order to obtain buildings.

Our Ambassador in Mexico occupies quarters in a rented building. It is necessary to provide space for our staffs, and if we can obtain such space with this class of funds, I believe money can be saved.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate longer. I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is seeking to obtain the floor in his own right.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, so that I may outline the program that it is intended to follow tomorrow and the remainder of the week?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is the purpose of the acting majority leader, if the Senate agrees, after the completion of this bill tonight, to have the Senate recess until tomorrow. It is proposed to call up three bills tomorrow, which I believe are noncontroversial. They are as follows:

Calendar No. 317, H. R. 1730, to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation.

Calendar No. 321, S. 690, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 8 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such property and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 320, S. 1461, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates.

Upon the completion of action on those bills, and following such other business as may come before the Senate, the acting majority leader would propose that the Senate recess until Monday, in order to afford an opportunity to committees, which have been having difficulty in conducting hearings while debate on the pending bill has been in progress, to hold meetings. For instance, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, which has been holding hearings on the armed-services budget, have been called to the Chamber 3 or 4 times to answer rollcalls. It is felt that the business of the Senate can be expedited if committees can work uninterruptedly and Senators can have an opportunity to catch up on their activities.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, would the acting majority leader kindly restate the bills which he proposes to have considered tomorrow?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The first bill which I would propose for consideration would be Calendar No. 317, H. R. 1730.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does that bill deal with?

Mr. KNOWLAND. H. R. 1730 is a bill to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation. The bill was reported by the Committee on Finance. That would be the first bill to be considered tomorrow.

Also, I would propose that Calendar No. 320, S. 1461, be considered, and possibly Calendar No. 321, S. 690.

Following completion of action on those measures, if they were completed tomorrow, I would propose that, at the conclusion of any other business, the Senate recess until Monday, in order to give committees an opportunity to function uninterruptedly.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

STATEMENT BY 195 MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE YUAN OF REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chinese Ambassador, transmitting, at the request of 195 members of the Legislative Yuan of the Republic of China, a statement by them relating to their views on the Korean problem, which, with the accompanying statement, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 5, beginning in line 12 was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the State Department dies hard. We have spent nearly $200 million in the past few years to provide sumptuous housing accommodations for members of the State Department abroad. In addition, out of reparations from Germany, which should have been credited to the accounts of the taxpayers of the United States, elaborate and costly palaces have been erected.

On Monday we made a move toward economy. But the State Department rallied its forces, and now seeks to put through its palace-purchase program.

FOREIGN CREDITS SHOULD BE USED FOR TAXPAYERS, NOT STATE DEPARTMENT

I am surprised at the argument of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that this is the only way that we can spend dollar credits and counterpart funds. These funds, it is true, are in terms of foreign currency; but it is also true, as will be shown, that they can be spent for a wide variety of purposes other than for buildings, and hence save money for the taxpayers. They can be spent for the Fulbright student-exchange program, which is financed from the sale of surplus property. It is also true that in nearly all countries where plans call for new buildings, they can be spent for the pay of foreign nationals in embassy and consular offices. By the way, such employees form the majority of our employees abroad; and to the degree that the credits are used for such purposes they will diminish by that amount the appropriations which we must make for the State Department.

I believe the RECORD will show that in many cases these funds can be used for the purchase of strategic minerals. I point out that in the Dutch currency area and in Indonesia, these funds can be used for the purchase of tin and rubber, which are vital to our stockpiling program. Such credits as we have in India can be used not only for the payment of native personnel, but also for the purchase of raw materials. This is particularly important in the case of manganese, which is vital to our production of steel. We depend upon overseas countries for manganese. India has one of the largest deposits of manganese in the world.

The idea that we must spend this money on buildings or lose it seems to me to be an extraordinary fallacy. That is the argument which we have heard from time to time on the floor of the Senate. It was the argument used to support the lavish expenditures of the army of occupation in Germany and the huge palace which was erected in Bonn.

Mr. President, these credits should be used for constructive purposes, to reduce expenditures which we would otherwise make for other purposes. But there is a final argument which I wish to stress——

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I wonder if the Senator can advise me whether counterpart funds were used to build or buy the four large homes which were being used by the High Commissioner to Germany

the last time I read anything about the situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is my information that those came out of German reparations.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I wonder if the Senator can tell me whether counterpart funds were being used in practically all the countries of Europe, not to house the ambassadors, but to house under secretaries, and second and third secretaries, in very fine large homes. Were those counterpart funds?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They were foreign credits owed to the United States.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I wonder if the Senator can advise me if he read in the newspapers along about the first of January, when the Secretary of Commerce came back from Europe, and when many Senators on both sides of the aisle came back from Europe, statements telling us of the lavish conditions under which Americans were living all over Europe. Did the Senator from Illinois read such statements?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly did; and I have myself seen many evidences of such lavish living.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I wonder if the Senator can tell me whether he thinks the construction or purchase of such buildings would help to change that condition, so that our representatives abroad might live more modestly and more in keeping with the dignity and simplicity of the American way of life.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that there is an item of $1 million for the construction of an office building and staff housing in New Delhi. How do the disciples of Mahatma Ghandi, believers in the simple life, welcome a $1 million housing project for American officials?

LAVISH QUARTERS HURT INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

This is a point upon which the very able Senator from Nebraska touched yesterday, and which I should like to emphasize. The rest of the world is poor. Part of the world is hungry. We are wealthy. Do Senators believe that we make friends and influence people for the United States by erecting lavish quarters for our diplomats to live in abroad? On the contrary, it excites envy, hostility, and opposition, and weakens the friendship which we should build up with other peoples.

Mr. President, the glory of America does not consist in lavish living, in elaborate buildings, in sumptuous quarters, in high-category meals, or in Cadillac automobiles. The glory of America consists in our principles; and those can be exemplified by simplicity of living far better than by lavish living.

Who have been the men and women who have made great impressions upon the people of foreign countries in the past few years? I pay tribute to our distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], who represented this country in Greece with great honor, distinction, and efficiency. Friends of mine reported that when they went to Athens they found him living in two rooms in a second-class hotel. By that very act he had convinced the Greeks that he was not over there seeking special privilege, that he was not there for a free ride, but that he was there to render service. The Senator from Nebraska, then the representative of this Government, did more, I think, to build sound relationships by his simplicity of living than if he had been housed in a quarter-of-a-million-dollar house.

Who did more in India—the professional diplomats who had gone before, and who high-hatted the Indians, or Chester Bowles, who lived among them, sent his children to Indian schools, rode a bicycle, and attended local gatherings?

Who did more in Denmark—the professional diplomats who went there to live in fancy quarters, or Mrs. Anderson, who gave a simple party for the workmen, learned the Danish language, and lived as one of the people?

The present situation is very different from that which existed 50 or 60 years ago. Then diplomats talked with diplomats. They dealt with courts. It may be that to acquire prestige it was necessary to have expensive surroundings. Now, however, our representatives must talk to the people. The diplomats are our representatives not only with other professional diplomats, but among the people of foreign countries. If they live lavishly they excite opposition and play into the hands of our opponents. If they exhibit simplicity and human kindness they win friends.

The argument that the United States of America must make a great show of luxury to impress the nations of the world is ridiculous. Since when must the world's most powerful country try to make a superficial show to impress those living in other lands? They are impressed already by our wealth and our strength. If we are to have firm friends in this time of great danger, we cannot permit the folly of allowing our representatives to create an air of arrogance for that is not typical of our beloved country. Our people are not wasters and spendthrifts living in the lap of luxury. We are a hard-working, frugal people who know the value of a dollar. We should not permit our representatives to present such a different impression.

So I object to this palace-purchase program of the State Department. These funds can be used for better purposes which will help the taxpayers and not alienate our allies. We can and must build friendship on a firmer foundation than sumptuous quarters. I hope very much that the motion to reconsider will not be agreed to.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Can the Senator state to the Senate the other purposes for which counterpart funds may be used?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The foreign credits can be used for the Fulbright program. They can be used for the pay of foreign personnel. They can be used for the purchase of strategic materials.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The answer of the Senator from Illinois was correct, but the Senator from Illinois was asked a question which does not deal with this particular amendment. The Senator from Illinois was answering a question with respect to counterpart funds. However, the answer to the question would not be correct so far as the funds covered by this amendment are concerned. In the case of the particular foreign credits to which this provision refers, such foreign credits in nowise touch counterpart funds. These are foreign credits which we received because of the sale of lend-lease materials; $6,000,000,000 worth of such materials were sold for $600,000,000. We are trying to get some value out of the $600,000,000. The Senator is correct insofar as these funds deal with the cost of buildings and the Fulbright program, but not so far as concerns the purchase of minerals. That subject applies to counterpart funds only.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). The Senator from Illinois still holds the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. The Senator from North Carolina will wait until the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] obtains the facts. We have heard a discussion, not about the facts, as I understand them. I saw some of these places last summer. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that, as I understand, these are not counterpart funds, in the first place, and therefore they cannot be used as counterpart funds.

As I understand from the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as well as from the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], these are funds which came about by reason of the sale of American supplies, about $650 million worth, and the funds now on hand can be used for only a few specific purposes, such as the acquisition of real estate and for Fulbright scholarships. As I understand, these funds cannot be used to pay the salaries of American officials; nor can they be used, as I understand, for the lush living the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has described. They are circumscribed and restricted to such an extent that if they are not used in some way for which the law now provides, they cannot be used at all.

After a while, in perhaps 5 or 10 years, someone will say, "Let us cancel all these debits against the foreign nations, and remit the funds to them."

As I understand from what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has told me, these funds can be used now for the purchase of real estate, which will become the property of the United States of America, and at least that much will not be given away. That is what I want the Senator from Louisiana to explain to the Senate, so we may have the facts,

and not a discussion of counterpart funds or other funds, other than these particular funds, which we know come from a different source.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that in the discussion which took place on Monday, it is my memory and understanding that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the President pro tempore of the Senate, stated that these funds were both foreign credits and counterpart funds, and I believe the RECORD will so show.

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps it was stated that way, but the facts are that these funds come from certain transactions other than the Marshall plan, such as lend-lease, war assets, and reparations, and the total amount aggregates $689,570,447, as of December 31, 1952. It is from these funds that the buildings are to be erected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the contention of the Senator from Louisiana that these funds can be used only for the purchase of real estate?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, no.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What are the other purposes for which these funds can be used?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us take Great Britain, for example. That is where a good deal of the money has been spent, and where we still have a great deal of this money outstanding.

I read from the memorandum:

> The balance outstanding under this settlement is, by the terms of the agreement, restricted to use for an educational program in England and to a building program in England and the colonial possessions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course the $4 million item under consideration does not contain any buildings planned for construction in Great Britain. But may I ask who furnished the memorandum from which the Senator from Louisiana is reading?

Mr. ELLENDER. The War Assets Administration. In some instances, I may say, these funds may be used for other purposes, but they are all restricted in use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator read about what they can be used for in India?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. With reference to India, the memorandum reads:

> While payments under this agreement are permissible, the options have not been exercised due to large amount held by Treasury. The balance shown in Treasury account represents proceeds from surplus property. Large amounts held in a second account of the Treasury have been sold to the Department and this source will be exhausted before June 30, 1953.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the statement shows that there are no restrictions on these credits in India.

Now, would the Senator read about Mexico? There would be $650,000 made available in Mexico.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a minute I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The funds in Mexico can be used for any United States expenses in Mexico.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is just the point. The $650,000 can be used for any purpose in Mexico. Why do we have to tie up the $650,000 in buildings?

What about France? It is proposed to build eight residences in Paris for use of the American Ambassador, Ministers, and attachés.

Mr. ELLENDER. In France $15 million of the funds may be used only for acquisition of property and $10 million for buildings or an educational program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At last we come to a country where it is proposed to construct a building where there are limitations on the use of the credits. Even here, the credits could be used for the acquisition of air bases or other military necessities. Now, for the general information of the Senate, what about Japan?

Mr. ELLENDER. According to this memorandum: "The surplus property settlement was not included in the Peace Treaty, but was left for subsequent settlement."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Louisiana suspend. There is so much audible conversation going on among Senators it is difficult to hear the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I read from the memorandum:

> The surplus-property settlement was not included in the peace treaty, but was left to subsequent settlement. Accelerated payments thereunder would be required in about 90 days. OFD is looking into this. An educational agreement has been approved for $4,750,000 of which a balance of $4,314,273 is outstanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Japanese credits could be used to meet the expenses of the occupation? Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would have to be done in accordance with an agreement entered into between our Government and Japan.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Although the item under consideration does not affect Japan, does the Senator from Louisiana believe that Japan would object to such an agreement, under which the expenses of the occupation could be reduced and in that way the burden on the American taxpayers correspondingly reduced? I think it will be found, from a reading of the available information, that only in a relatively small number of countries are there severe restrictions in effect. Only one building included in the $4 million item is affected; that is the one at Tangier. There are not any restrictions in the case of Mexico and India. What about Indonesia? There is a proposal to build buildings worth $350,000 in Indonesia.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Illinois has stated that the Senator from New Hampshire referred to counterpart funds during the debate on Monday. The Senator from New Hampshire did use the phrase "counterpart funds." He also used phrases such as "foreign funds," and "foreign currency," and "foreign credits." But he did use the phrase "counterpart funds." The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] also used that term.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Largely because the Senator from New Hampshire had used the phrase. I assumed I had it right out of the horse's mouth.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am looking at page 5812 of the RECORD. The amendment was called up, and the first statement about it was the statement of the Senator from Illinois. I read:

> Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will not be agreed to. It increases the expenditures of the United States Government for the acquisition of buildings abroad, for which we have already appropriated very large sums. I believe we have appropriated approximately $200 million for the acquisition of buildings abroad.

I skip a portion of his statement. Then he said:

> For this purpose the Senate committee proposes to spend $4 million out of counterpart funds.

Therefore the first mention of counterpart funds was made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The Senator from New Hampshire readily admits the use of that phrase, and the phrases "foreign credits" and "foreign currencies," in a very general way. The Senator from New Hampshire desires to correct the inference that he was using the term as an exclusive term, when in fact he was using the term as a general term. However, I agree with the Senator from Illinois that the phrase "counterpart funds" should not have been used as a restrictive term.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not interested in scoring points off the Senator from New Hampshire. The reality, not the terms used, is the main thing.

I point out that in the third column of page 5814 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is shown to have said:

> We are dealing not only with counterpart funds, but with foreign credits which have been built up under various programs.

Since we are dealing not only with counterpart funds, the implication certainly was that we are dealing partly with counterpart funds.

The really important point is, not whether we have counterpart funds or foreign credits from the sale of surplus equipment, but whether the funds can be used.

I submit that although there are restrictions in the case of the use of such funds in France there are no restrictions in the case of the use of such funds in Mexico or the other countries involved; and in large part the use of this money for building would decrease the amount of money which would then be available to be spent for other purposes and help the taxpayers.

FRANCE IS ONLY COUNTRY AFFECTED WHERE THERE ARE RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF CREDIT

As a matter of fact, if there are restrictions which apply in the case of the use of such funds in France, I suggest that we stop the palace-construction program, and that we increase the student-exchange program, use the credits for military purposes such as airstrips and barracks, or renegotiate the agreement. I have seen, as many other per-

sons have, the large number of United States buildings in Paris and in London. I believe there are 16 residences for our staff personnel in London, in addition to the elaborate buildings in Grosvenor Square.

In Paris the United States State Department is housed in magnificent palaces.

Last summer I was in Rome, and I can say that there the United States Embassy was housed in two of the most magnificent palaces in Rome, near the Villa Borghese. Those buildings stuck out like a sore thumb. The very elaborateness of those quarters feeds anti-American propaganda.

I think it is time we had simplicity in living and simplicity in quarters, not only to save money for the American taxpayers, but also to increase American prestige, because in the modern world we do not increase prestige by indulging in elaborate spending. On the contrary, elaborate spending serves only to excite envy and jealousy.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I wonder whether my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, has given consideration to one phase of the matter which has not been brought up on the floor while I have been present. I refer to the fact that it is desirable that the United States own its own embassy buildings. It is desirable that, if possible, the United States erect those buildings. That is desirable for security reasons.

Several years ago Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, and I went abroad to study the question of security. When we returned, we made to the State Department definite recommendations for improving our security abroad. After some time, we inquired how many of our recommendations had been carried out. We learned that of the dozen recommendations we had made, approximately 10 had been put into effect, but that there were others which could not be put into effect with the funds available to the State Department.

One of our recommendations which could not be carried out was that the United States own its own embassies, because we found that in a number of cases where leased buildings had been used by our representatives abroad, the walls of the buildings had been wired for listening purposes, and thus there was no security at all from spies.

I agree with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois, that we should not have lavish buildings; but I believe we should have adequate buildings and dignified buildings. Above all, I believe we should have secure buildings, if we expect to compete with nations who indulge in various ways of obtaining secret information.

For that reason, I believe it very desirable that the counterpart funds be used for the construction of buildings in foreign countries, where we do not own buildings now. That is the purpose of this item.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who seems to have before him the document relating to this matter, a question about the uses to which foreign credits may be put in Finland and in Holland, because an expenditure of $600,000 is proposed for the Legation office building in Finland, and an expenditure of $525,000 is contemplated for an Embassy office building at The Hague, in Holland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois had already asked me about an item in regard to Indonesia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was another item.

Mr. ELLENDER. Previously I stated that these funds are spent through agreement between the United States and the country involved.

In the case of Indonesia, the money can be spent for any purpose, but the purpose to which the money is to be devoted must be agreed upon by the two governments.

An agreement which was entered into provides that $7 million may be used for an educational program and $1,300,000 may be used for buildings, both being subject to change by way of negotiation.

The same is true with respect to all the other cases of this sort in respect to these foreign credits; the funds may be used only by way of negotiation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Louisiana state the specific added information in the case of the Netherlands and Finland?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. In the case of the Netherlands, the agreement is that the money is available for any United States expenses, and there is no annual limitation on the amount that may be drawn.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say here that $650,000, I believe, is proposed to be spent for an office building in the Netherlands, although the Senator from Louisiana has already stated that the money could be used for any other purpose.

Will the Senator from Louisiana now state the situation in the case of Finland?

Mr. ELLENDER. The paragraph with respect to Finland reads:

> An educational program in the amount of $1,250,000 has been approved for Finland and funds in that amount reserved. The Finland agreement has no annual limitation and funds received thereunder are available for any United States expenses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to point out that there is another half million. It turns out that the only restrictions in countries where it is proposed to construct buildings are with respect to France, and that in the other countries the funds can be used for any purpose. This is borne out by the statement inserted by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I am very sorry that our good friends have, so to speak, committed themselves, as a result of misleading statements conveyed to them by someone, presumably by the State Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 5, line 12, was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—48

Aiken	George	Millikin
Bennett	Gore	Mundt
Bridges	Green	Payne
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Russell
Capehart	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Case	Hill	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Daniel	Kefauver	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Kuchel	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	McClellan	Young

NAYS—23

Clements	Hoey	Kennedy
Douglas	Holland	Kerr
Eastland	Humphrey	Lehman
Goldwater	Jackson	Mansfield
Griswold	Jenner	Martin

Maybank	Neely	Smathers
Monroney	Pastore	Williams
Morse	Potter	

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Fulbright	McCarthy
Barrett	Gillette	Murray
Beall	Hennings	Purtell
Bricker	Hunt	Robertson
Bush	Ives	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Long	Welker
Dirksen	Magnuson	
Frear	McCarran	

So Mr. MUNDT's motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment in line 16, page 5, that the sum of $4 million be stricken and that there be substituted therefor the amount of $1,500,000; and that after the colon on line 17, the following proviso be inserted: *"Provided,* That these funds shall not be used where such foreign credits can by agreement be used for general purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois send his amendment to the desk so that the clerk may state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 5, line 16, to strike out "$4,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$1,500,000"; and after the colon in line 17 to insert the following proviso: *"Provided,* That these funds shall not be used where such foreign credits can by agreement be used for general purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (putting the question). The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. MAYBANK and other Senators asked for a division.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On a division, the amendment is rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, did I not suggest the absence of a quorum before the result of the vote was announced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall be willing to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum if we may have the yeas and nays.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, had not the Chair announced the result of the vote before the Senator from Illinois suggested the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois suggested the absence of a quorum before the announcement of the vote.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois merely suggested the absence of a quorum. He did not address the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the customary way in which the absence of a quorum is noted in the Senate.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Mundt
Capehart	Hoey	Neely
Carlson	Holland	Pastore
Case	Humphrey	Payne
Chavez	Jackson	Potter
Clements	Jenner	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Kilgore	Sparkman
Ellender	Knowland	Stennis
Ferguson	Kuchel	Symington
Flanders	Lehman	Thye
George	Malone	Watkins
Goldwater	Mansfield	Wiley
Gore	Martin	Williams
Green	Maybank	Young
Griswold	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk amendments A, B, and C, dated June 1, 1953, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, after line 18, insert the following:

SEC. —. Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State whose position is excepted from the competitive civil service, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

On page 52, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whose position is excepted from the competitive civil service, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

On page 28, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, the Attorney General may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Justice whose position is excepted from the competitive civil service, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if we might have an agreement that the Senate may vote on the three amendments en bloc.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, it is agreeable to vote on the three amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the three amendments will be considered and voted on en bloc.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the hour is late, and I realize the situation. So far as I am concerned, it is not my intention to press for a record vote. If a voice vote is clearly determinative, and if it is agreeable to the Senator from Kansas, certainly it will be agreeable to me, with the right, of course, of any Senator to demand a record vote.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be kept clear, I wish to raise the point of order which was originally made yesterday to the amendment relating to the Department of State, but applying also to the other two departments, all three amendments now being considered en bloc. The point of order was that suspension of the rule must be voted in order to reach consideration of these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the point of order can be raised, but the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] did give notice that he would move to suspend the rule.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the vote then be on the motion of the Senator from Michigan to suspend the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the point of order is made, the question will be on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. MONRONEY. I make the point of order that the three amendments now being considered en bloc are legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to know whether an amendment would be in order before the vote is taken on the motion to suspend the rule, or would an amendment to the proposed amendment be in order after the motion has been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment would be in order if the rule were suspended. It would then be in order to submit germane amendments.

If the point of order were sustained, and the amendments were ruled out of order, the Senator from Arkansas could offer a new amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish t serve notice that if the rule is suspended, I shall offer an amendment to the proposed amendment which would exempt from the effect of the amendment all persons who are covered by the Veterans' Preference Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, but I wish the RECORD to show what the Senate is to vote on if the rule is suspended.

For 7 years the Secretary of State has had authority to remove employees from his Department at his discretion, at any time he desired to do so. The other day, I stated that I was opposed to such a grant of authority to the Secretary of State or to any other officer at the present time, and that, because of Public Law 733 and Executive Order 10450, I did not think such authority was necessary. However, I did feel that the heads of agencies and departments should have some authority to remove some of the employees who were blanketed into their positions under civil service, but without having taken civil service examinations. The pending amendment applies only to exempted civil-service employees. The persons now holding these exempted positions did not take competitive civil-service examinations for their positions. Senators should keep that in mind. They obtained their positions by political appointments.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has stated that he would offer an amendment to provide that veterans be given preference, as provided under the Veterans' Preference Act. He has said that he would submit an amendment to the bill when we reached the place for its consideration. But I wish to remind the Senate that, in the first place, no consideration of veterans' preference was given when these appointments were made. These persons were simply blocked in, so to speak, through political appointments.

Heads of agencies and departments of the Government are now embarrassed, if I may use that word, because there are few employees whom they can remove.

I think the question before the Senate today is simply whether Senators are willing to give to the heads of departments the same discretion that has been given to them for 20 years to blanket in or to employ persons who will cooperate with them, whose thinking is along the same lines as that of the new administration. I believe the Senate this afternoon is trying to determine whether it is willing to give the heads of departments that much leeway.

Senators should not be concerned about the 2½ million regular, classified civil-service employees. They would not be affected by this amendment. The amendment was written purposely to take care of them. I would not go along with any proposal to give the heads of departments or agencies authority to remove classified civil-service employees, but I would go along, and I believe there is much merit in going along, with an amendment that would permit the head of an agency to surround himself with persons who would work with him.

It would not be necessary to remove all exempted persons, and they would not be removed. There are 21,000 of them in the FBI. Do Senators think that any Senator or the head of any agency, would do anything to upset the FBI? Of course not. We would not think of doing that. However, there are a few persons whom the heads of agencies should be authorized to remove.

To show that my amendment has some merit, I wish to read for the RECORD a telegram I have received from James R. Watson, executive director of the National Civil Service League. That organization has been fighting the battle for civil-service employees for years. The telegram reads:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 2, 1953.*

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate:

The National Civil Service League endorses your amendment to the so-called McCarran rider which would restrict power to summarily discharge employees of the Department of State, Commerce and Justice to positions exempt from civil-service protection. This modification in effect eliminates the protective provisions of the Veterans Preference Act from these exempt positions. We believe the modification is in line with the original intent of Congress in passing the Veterans' Preference Act. The new administration must be permitted to fill top policy-making positions with individuals of their own choosing.

Your amendment recognizes correctly that it is the protective aspects of veterans' preference more than the civil-service system that now impedes the new administration.

The original McCarran rider endangered the basic fabric of the civil service. Your modification places correct emphasis on the program and should help clear up public misunderstandings about civil service.

JAMES R. WATSON,
Executive Director, National Civil Service League.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CARLSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The distinguished Senator from Kansas is chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. There may be considerable merit to the argument he makes this afternoon, but why should what he seeks be done by the process of a rider on an appropriation bill? Why has not a bill been introduced to accomplish precisely what the Senator is suggesting, so that hearings can be held? If there is any merit to the Senator's argument, the action he favors can be accomplished through the proper processes of committee consideration.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has made a very good point. I firmly believe that this matter should be handled by legislation, but we were confronted with this fact: Three amendments were included in an appropriation bill. I would not go along with them, but I felt that it was my duty to have a substitute to offer to the Senate. I have the substitute, and I am ready to defend it at any time. I believe our committee ought to consider the matter.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to ask the distinguished and competent chairman of the Civil Service Committee if the Civil Service Commission, under President Eisenhower, has recommended this action?

Mr. CARLSON. No; I would not say it has, but I have discussed the matter with the Commission.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Could the Senator estimate the number of employees in the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce, to whom the Senator's amendment would apply?

Mr. CARLSON. I should say that most of the Foreign Service personnel are in the exempt class. I believe about 20,000 employees are in that group. I do not think it would be in the interest of anyone to remove 20,000 Foreign Service employees.

In the State Department, 22,921 employees are excepted. About 1,730 would be affected by my amendment, or I assume they might be reached through the amendment.

In the Department of Justice, probably about 2,000 employees would be affected.

I have secured these figures from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Did the Senator give the figures as to the Department of Commerce?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not happen to have them.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the figure for the Department of Justice.

Mr. CARLSON. Roughly, 2,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is my understanding correct, that employees of the FBI are not under civil service?

Mr. CARLSON. So I am advised.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the effect of the Senator's amendment would be to open up the entire FBI list?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true also that the great majority of those employed by the State Department, and throughout the Foreign Service, are not under civil service?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator's amendment would open up those positions?

Mr. CARLSON. I so stated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I recall the act, there is already a provision in the permanent law under which employees of the FBI may be discharged, and they

are not covered by the Senator's amendment. I read from page 20, line 18 of the bill:

None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee.

They have never been under civil service. In my opinion, the FBI could not be operated under civil service.

Mr. CARLSON. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that no one would think of moving out the employees of the FBI. That is not considered at all. I did not bring up the amendment for that reason.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I ask the distinguished Senator if the 300,000 employees to which his amendment is directed now enjoy the same status as those who were properly taken in under civil service laws?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, because of the Veterans' Preference Act and the La Follette Act.

Mr. COOPER. If the head of the Department wished to remove one of those employees, would such employee now be entitled to the same rights as one who had been properly taken in under civil-service laws?

Mr. CARLSON. He would, absolutely.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask another question. Does the Senator believe that the President's order and Public Law 733 are adequate to cover the situation?

Mr. CARLSON. I think the President's order and Public Law 733 are all that is necessary at this time to remove individuals in any branch of the classified service, but I do not believe that they reach the excepted class. It is in that field that I believe the head of the Department should have some authority.

Mr. COOPER. Under the President's order is there authority to do what the Senator intends to accomplish by his amendments, with the exception of the fact that the employee would have the right of appeal? Is that the difference between the President's order and the amendments of the distinguished Senator?

Mr. CARLSON. I think the President's order is very broad and would go far enough to take care of this situation. However, I do not think the President's order should be used in many instances. Many of these individuals are not cooperating, so to speak, with the head of the agency. I think that is the point which ought to be emphasized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has made the point of order that the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair has examined the amendments. They do propose to give certain cabinet heads authority and discretion not authorized in existing law. Therefore they would amend existing law, and are in contravention of the rule. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, notice was filed of a motion to suspend the rule, which would require a two-thirds vote to permit consideration of the three amendments en bloc. I presume the question now is on the suspension of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a motion to suspend were made, that would be true.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is there no pending motion to suspend the rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Notice was given, but the motion itself has not been made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended, pursuant to notice already given by the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan moves that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended.

Under the unanimous-consent order already agreed to, the amendments will be voted upon en bloc if the rule is suspended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest a division.

Mr. MONRONEY rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma desire recognition?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am seeking recognition on the question of suspending the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, these amendments of the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee [Mr. CARLSON] are better only to the degree that, instead of affecting some 2 million employees, they affect some 310,000 employees. Largely those 310,000 employees are in the same status of career service as their brothers in the total civil-service picture. The idea that those employees were placed in political patronage jobs simply does not square with the facts of the case.

There is a total of 150,000 such employees. In the State Department there are 1,800, largely in Foreign Service; in the Treasury Department 2,400; in the Army 11,500; in the Air Force 2,900; in the Navy 10,000; in the Department of Justice 15,500, including all the FBI; in the Department of the Interior 6,000; in the Department of Commerce 30,000; in the Atomic Energy Commission 6,200; in the Mutual Security Administration 2,000; in the Federal Security Agency 2,000; in the Veterans' Administration 25,000, including doctors, dentists, nurses, orderlies and other medical attendants; and in the TVA 20,000. Outside the continental limits of the United States there are 27,000 in the State Department, largely Foreign Service officers. The Mutual Security Administration has 10,000; the Army, Navy, and Air Force have a combined total of 110,000. The Panama Canal has 15,000.

Those are the 310,000 employees who are threatened with immediate discharge without cause, and without reference to veterans' preference in any way, shape, or form. They are the same type of civil-service employees as is to be found in all other Government agencies, except that they may have had the misfortune, after a certain number of years under civil service, to have their agency classified under the excepted status, because of the confidential nature or the technical and scientific nature of their employment. Their agency may have been classified under the excepted status because it was not feasible to give competitive civil-service examinations or to find the proper applicants for such jobs because of the scientific or supersensitive nature of the positions.

President Eisenhower has expanded this classification to take in another category, which is that of policymaking positions. The effect could be expanded, not to 310,000 but to 510,000 or any other number desired. Any of the 310,000 in the excepted services can be fired today at the will of the Secretaries here involved, if they are not veterans. But if they are veterans they have a preference. The Carlson amendments would wipe out veterans' preference.

I have before me telegrams from the Disabled War Veterans, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, condemning the Carlson amendments as being destructive of veterans' rights.

Mr. President, in the interest of time, I yield the floor so that the Senate may vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], pursuant to notice given by him on the first instant, to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, in order that certain amendments which have heretofore been held to be subject to a point of order may be offered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I know that it would be practically impossible to accomplish a suspension of the rule. I merely wish to say that unless this authority is given to the heads of departments—and I am referring now particularly to the State Department—we could have a continuation of the betrayal of this country's interests which has gone on in the past in that Department of Government.

Today, in the Internal Security Committee we had paraded before us employees of the Federal Government who never took a civil-service examination. My good friends on the other side of the aisle know it to be true that when we have asked some of the witnesses if they are members of the Communist Party they refused to answer under the protection of the fifth amendment of the Constitution, which is a recognized ground for refusal to answer.

Mr. President, we all admit we are living in a time of crisis. Some of the worst betrayals of this country are not crimes. Owen Lattimore, in the State Department, never took a civil-service examination. I am becoming a little weary of hearing a little talk of veterans' preference. Are we talking about Democratic veterans or Republican veterans? Owen Lattimore never took a civil-service examination. I presume that in the eyes of the law he never committed a

crime, because it is not a crime to teach that the Chinese Communists are merely agrarian reformers. But the damage is done.

Do we want to continue a policy of handcuffing the Chief Executive and handcuffing Cabinet members so they cannot get rid of a man of that stripe and that ilk, when they know he is doing great damage to this country?

So far as civil service is concerned, I wonder if it should not all be revised. I understand that the Government has been trying to fire a drunken employee, and the case has been taken all the way up to the United States Supreme Court. The Government has spent a half million dollars trying to fire him, and he is still on the payroll.

Politics is one thing, the security and peace of this great country of ours is another.

Let me remind Senators that we have had before our committee such men as Coe, Glasser, and Smith. I say we should take the wraps off people like that.

In these highly technical and sensitive positions, let the discretion lie with the head of the department as to whether an employee is unfaithful, because his unfaithfulness may very well wreck our country.

That is why we are in the trouble we are in. It is not the crimes that Owen Lattimore committed, but the influencing of men in high positions that brought it on.

Time cannot be lost waiting for judicial proof that persons who gave false advice were deliberately disloyal.

I think at this time in our history, if we cannot trust the head of our executive government and the Cabinet members—and I am particularly referring to the State Department—then I say we will have a continuation of the sell-out of the Nation's interests, as we have had in the past; and as blood is dripping from the bodies of American boys in Korea it will be dripping from the bodies of American boys in the four corners of the earth.

Now let us vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask two or three questions of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Is it a fact that for the past 7 years the Secretary of State has had authority to discharge suspected persons within that Department.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that authority granted by reason of a rider in an appropriation bill similar to that which we are now considering?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct; in 1946.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it a fact that for the past 3 years the Secretary of Commerce has had full authority to discharge suspected persons in his department without preliminary or routine procedures?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it a fact that the Secretary of Defense was granted authority by the 81st Congress, under Public Law 733, to suspend suspected persons working for the Department of Defense, without going through any routine procedures?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The employees have the right of appeal, have they not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Secretary has——

Mr. BRIDGES. The Secretary has the right of automatically suspending employees.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary has the right to suspend suspected persons or subversives or perverts or poor security risks, without going through any long-drawn-out procedure?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the purpose of the pending provision in the appropriation bill to give the Secretaries of the departments involved the same authority to suspend poor security risks or suspected subversives who are working in their departments, who are not covered by civil service?

Mr. BRIDGES. The purpose is to give the same authority, for example, to Secretary Dulles that Dean Acheson had for years and did not use, except to a limited extent.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand he did use it to the extent of discharging several hundred undesirable employees.

Mr. BRIDGES. He did to a certain degree. I modify my statement. Yes; it is to allow Cabinet officers to have the right to rid themselves of subversives and homosexuals, and all other undesirables.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire, with reference to such persons, if it is suspected that they might do considerable damage to the national security, that the Secretaries should have the right to suspend them and to put them out of the department, where they cannot do any further damage?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations tell us how many veterans are actually involved in these groups?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know, but I think relatively few.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not possible that our friends on the other side of the aisle may be attempting to keep in service a great many people who are hiding behind veterans' preference but who are not actually veterans?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. What we would like to do is to provide that the Secretaries can get rid of sexual perverts and poor security risks and drunkards, and in that way perhaps we can get some Korean war veterans into those positions. Instead of trying to protect some of the perverts and bad security risks, if the authority is given to the Secretaries, perhaps we can replace some of those persons with veterans of World War II and veterans from Korea.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire observe a change of attitude on the part of some Senators, who for the past few years have steadfastly insisted that the heads of departments should have the right to rid their departments of suspected subversives and perverts, in that such Senators now take the position that the heads of departments should not have that right; and does not the Senator from New Hampshire find such a change of attitude a little short of amazing?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; they have gone around the circle, to the other side of the issue.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee whether President Eisenhower, under the completely revamped loyalty program, issued under an Executive order, has not broadened the base and equipped the heads of all Government departments with a sound system of getting rid of these characters, whom various distinguished Republican Members of the Senate have mentioned; and therefore, would it not be assuming that the President's loyalty program is of no consequence, of no value, and of no effectiveness at all, if we place on the statute books the proposed summary legislation, which grants opportunity to a Republican department head to convict without proof of any charge made and to fire at will any of the 300,000 employees, some of whom are veterans of World War II and of the Korean war?

Mr. BRIDGES. It would allow the department heads to fire a Russian spy, for example.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill does not say anything about firing any Russian spy. It gives blanket authority to department heads to fire at will anyone because they do not like the color of an employee's eyes or the way he parts his hair.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire whether he recalls the testimony of James F. Byrnes, who was Secretary of State—of course, at this time he is Governor of South Carolina—when in 1946 he testified before the Appropriations Committee, at the time when we were working on this particular problem. Does the Senator from New Hampshire recall that at that time Secretary Byrnes told us that it was essential that he have this kind of law, because it was impossible for him to go through with the long, tedious trials required under civil service, in order to ferret out the subversives and others who, in the interest of the United States, should be discharged from his Department?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was done upon his recommendation, was it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether the testimony taken before the Appropriations Committee shows that in the opinion of those in the State Department, such a provision is now essential, in order that we may protect our security; and I ask my colleague whether the testimony shows that such action cannot be taken by the loyalty boards or in any way by giving the head of the Department authority to discharge in his own discretion and on his own responsibility?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended, for the purpose of permitting the submission of the three amendments referred to.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 35, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Ferguson	Mundt
Bennett	Flanders	Payne
Bricker	Goldwater	Potter
Bridges	Griswold	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Jenner	Thye
Case	Knowland	Watkins
Cooper	Kuchel	Wiley
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Duff	Martin	Young
Dworshak	Millikin	

NAYS—36

Chavez	Holland	Maybank
Clements	Humphrey	McClellan
Daniel	Jackson	Monroney
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
George	Kefauver	Robertson
Gore	Kennedy	Smathers
Green	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	Kilgore	Sparkman
Hill	Lehman	Stennis
Hoey	Mansfield	Symington

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Gillette	Murray
Barrett	Hennings	Purtell
Beall	Hunt	Russell
Bush	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Long	Tobey
Dirksen	Magnuson	Welker
Frear	McCarran	
Fulbright	McCarthy	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, the motion to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI is rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that the vote just taken and announced will also apply to the committee amendment appearing on page 28, after line 15, in the case of the Department of Justice, and also to the committee amendment appearing on page 52, after line 19, in the case of the Department of Commerce. It has been agreed that those amendments, if it were possible to consider them as a result of an agreement to the motion to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, would be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, both those committee amendments will be considered as disagreed to, along with the committee amendment on page 16, after line 18, which was ruled out on a point of order, on June 1.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, let me inquire of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire whether I am correct in my understanding that all action on the committee amendments has now been concluded.

Mr. BRIDGES. It has been concluded.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I call up two amendments which I have previously sent to the desk. So far as I am concerned, the amendments can be consolidated, for the purpose of voting on them.

The first amendment I have sent to the desk reads as follows: On page 50, line 12, strike out "$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000."

The second amendment reads as follows: On page 50, lines 19 and 20, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,613,000."

Mr. President, these amendments relate to research and testing and radio propagation and standards, under the National Bureau of Standards.

In support of the two amendments I have offered I should like to say, though I know the time is getting late, that the Bureau's regular scientific program is supported by two appropriations, research and testing, and radio propagation and standards. The funds provided by these appropriations make it possible for the Bureau to undertake research and development work in areas related to the Bureau's basic responsibility for the standards of physical measurement. They support, as well, the Bureau's calibration and testing of instruments used throughout the Nation's laboratories in comparison with the basic standards of physical measurement which the Bureau develops and maintains in its laboratories in Washington.

These two appropriations were for four and two and three-quarter million dollars, respectively in fiscal year 1953. For fiscal year 1954 it has been now proposed that they be reduced by approximately 25 percent. The purpose of these remarks is to show that these reductions, if allowed to stand, will result in irreparable damage to the Nation's scientific and technological resources. Therefore, I want to recommend that these two appropriations be allowed to remain during fiscal year 1954 at the levels recommended by the new administration.

If the two appropriations are reduced to a total of $5 million, the Bureau will be receiving for its basic scientific functions approximately 10 percent less in dollars than it received from the Congress in fiscal year 1947. Since fiscal year 1947, however, as we all know, the prices of services, supplies, and various technical materials which the Bureau must purchase for its work have greatly increased. There has also been a significant increase in the level of civil-service salaries paid to the scientists, engineers, and technicians now on its payroll. Accordingly, the proposed reduction will place the capacity of the National Bureau of Standards to perform the services required of it by American science and industry at a level much below the levels of fiscal year 1947, which was the first year of its comeback from almost 100 percent utilization as a military laboratory during the Second World War. Not only will its capacity be thus reduced, but—and most significantly—the Bureau, for the first time in 20 years, will be forced to undergo a reduction in force in its regular technical staff.

For emphasis, I desire to repeat that statement. The proposed reduction will place the capacity of the National Bureau of Standards to perform the services required of it by American science and industry at a level much below the levels of fiscal year 1947, which was the first year of its comeback from almost 100 percent utilization as a military laboratory during the Second World War. Not only will its capacity be thus reduced, but—and most significantly—the Bureau, for the first time in 20 years, will be forced to undergo a reduction in force in its regular technical staff.

I think that is important for the Senate to consider.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order? We cannot understand the speaker in this area.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. If I understood correctly, the Senator said that unless these amounts are granted, there will be a reduction in the technical staff in the Bureau of Standards. Is that correct?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. That is correct. I have been so advised by those in responsible positions within the Bureau.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator mean by the technical staff the men who really do the scientific and technical work in the important field of radio and other fields?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. In the matter of collaboration, and with respect to the other scientific work, the Senator from Mississippi is correct, according to the information which the Senator from Kansas has received.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator have the figures as to the amount of contractual work the Bureau of Standards has been doing increasingly during the past few years; that is, contractural work in competition with private and semiprivate research organizations?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the Senator, frankly, I do not have those figures.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator aware that the Bureau of Standards may possibly be injecting itself directly into competition with private and semiprivate organizations, such as institutional research laboratories, which are already established and are doing a great deal of work, and that the Bureau is entering into the field of competition, seeking contracts, for example, which have heretofore gone to private institutions, or, by way of illustration, let us say, to colleges and universities and other research laboratories?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. My understanding is to the effect that the cutting of this appropriation will cripple the work the Bureau actually does, outside the work to which the Senator is referring.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That, of course, will put a different light on it, in my mind, and in the Senator's understanding. I do not question the Senator's word, but I am fearful that, in recent years, the Bureau of Standards has been invading a competitive field; that it has not stuck to its knitting, as a very restricted arm and service of the Government, with its interests as a scientific laboratory, limited as they have been heretofore; but has entered into competition with research organizations, and thus getting into a field for which it never was intended or designed. In so doing, it has built plants at various places to enable it to accept and to carry out contracts which it has gone forth to seek; and it needs some of this money to maintain the expanded program which it has built up as a result of private contracts.

I am not sure about that. I am not on a committee which has gone into that matter. But I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas whether he can give us any light on that subject. I do not wish to destroy the normal, ordinary functions of the Bureau of Standards, but I am not disposed to support the Bureau when it enters into competition and builds plants to enable it to do so, and then wants more employees to man the plants, and more money with which it may seek contracts in order to keep going plants that are outside the scope of its normal activities. I do not say that is true; I am merely suggesting that there is that feeling on the part of many people. I should like to have some light on it, if the Senator can furnish it.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa that I cannot give him detailed information on that subject, but my information is to the effect that this cut will affect the personnel and the services performed in the ordinary, regular, channeled activities of the Bureau.

It may well be that some of the activities to which the Senator has referred could be and would be objectionable. The Senator from Kansas is not going to say on the floor of the Senate that perhaps there has not been some expanded relationship; but I am talking this evening regarding the ordinary, regular, channeled activities of the Bureau of Standards in the scientific field, which have already been expanded tremendously, as I am sure the Senator from Iowa knows. I am not an expert on this subject, but when I note that $1,600,000 is involved, it would not seem to me that the Bureau could expand too much with new plants and new activities.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kansas will yield further, I may say I am not raising the point or taking issue in regard to the particular amount. I am only raising the question as to the principle, in the matter of the new pattern of operation that may be developing. I shall be very frank about it. I think very highly of the Bureau of Standards. It has done some very excellent work in the past, and I feel sure it will do some very excellent work in the future, in connection, for example, with the Army and the Navy, and its service to scientific groups, by way of research. But it runs in my mind, if we must also support some of the great research institutions, operating under our great universities and our colleges, that it is our duty to see that they do not suffer by reason of a governmental agency acting as a competitor taking work away from them in many places. I am a little apprehensive of the policy of the agency in expanding itself.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say in reply that the Senator from Iowa knows, of course, that there is a new head of the Department of Commerce. I am sure the Senator is aware that recently the Secretary of Commerce has taken action which has resulted in the appointment of the National Academy of Sciences to make a complete study of the functions of the Bureau of Standards in relation to present national needs. I shall cover that point a little later in my statement. I think it has a very substantial bearing on the question which the Senator has asked. I feel that with the present head of the Department of Commerce and they way in which he is approaching the question, if some of the activities which the Senator has mentioned exist, they will be corrected.

I wish to point out that the only time during the last generation the National Bureau of Standards has had to reduce its regular technical staff was during the fiscal year 1934. There is no question that a reduction in force, carried out at a time that the Bureau's backlogs of requirements for scientific information and tests of various kinds are greater than they have ever been, will represent a blow to the Bureau's effective efforts and to its capacity to keep and recruit a competent scientific staff which it will be difficult, if not impossible, to overcome in future years.

I am told that the backlog of work has tremendously increased, and if its appropriations are cut to this low figure, I cannot help but believe the work of the Bureau will be crippled.

Aside from the greatly diminished capacity of the Bureau to serve much greater needs than existed a few years ago, the Bureau's ability to carry out current and very important commitments for the weapons programs of the Department of Defense will be seriously impaired. It is true that neither of these two basic Bureau appropriations supports directly any of the work of the Department of Defense. However, the Bureau's abilities to maintain a competent scientific staff working on defense projects and to use, for consultation and advice on military programs, its entire senior technical staff, will be obviously reduced. I have been told that 85 percent of the Bureau's present total program is devoted directly to the interests of national security. I must take someone's word for it. I questioned representatives of the Department on that matter, and I am sure I have been correctly informed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator repeat his last statement, please?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Bureau's abilities to maintain a competent scientific staff working on defense projects and to use, for consultation and advice on military programs, its entire senior technical staff, will be obviously reduced. Some 85 percent of the Bureau's present total program is devoted directly to the interests of national security.

In this connection, it should be made clear, however, that the availability of large amounts of funds from the Department of Defense does not, in any way, decrease the importance to the Bureau of its regular appropriations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I shall be glad to yield to the acting majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the hour is now approaching 8 o'clock, and if

it be agreeable to the distinguished Senator from Kansas and to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, and if I may be permitted to interrupt without the Senator from Kansas losing his right to the floor, so that he will be in the same position when the Senate convenes tomorrow, I would propose that the Senate take a recess at this time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the distinguished acting majority leader that I had hoped we could finish the consideration of the bill tonight. The Members of the Senate have been very patient and tolerant. They have stayed so far this afternoon, and I know they have spoiled their evening. I was under the impression that the only amendment to be considered is that of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. I just heard by the "grapevine" that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has several amendments which he is going to propose. If that be the case, and his amendments are going to take some time, I do not want to keep Senators beyond a reasonable hour.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. It seems that there is considerable unanimity here with reference to the amendments of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thought that if the bill was to go over until tommorrow anyway, and there are some Senators who have amendments to offer while there was no commitment made that we would not have any more votes tonight, some Senators on this side of the aisle have pointed out that the hour is late, and the Senate might recess until tomorrow.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished acting majority leader that I shall certainly not have any objection to taking a recess at this time, providing I do not lose my place on the floor tomorrow.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has made such a persuasive argument with reference to this particular amendment, and in view of the fact that I have checked on this side and find no question in the mind of any Senator that the amendment should be adopted, I wonder if the chairman of the committee will not agree to the amendment and let us get it out of the way.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the acting minority leader that I have talked with various members of the committee, and most of the Senators to whom I have talked are absolutely opposed to the position of the Senator from Kansas. I have found only one Senator who favors his position. It is pointed out that the Bureau is getting two or three times the total appropriations and transfers from other departments than they are perhaps entitled to, and some Senators feel very strongly about it. So I would not have the backing of my committee if I acquiesced in accepting the amendment.

Mr. GORE. I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed, lie on the table, and be considered tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

THE AIR FORCE

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' remarks,

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, to permit me to request unanimous consent to have certain testimony and a memorandum printed in the body of the RECORD?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to pursue a little further the subject I have been discussing with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask unanimous consent to have some testimony and a memorandum relative to another matter printed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina, if it is understood that in doing so I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Without objection, the Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I rise only to request unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD some testimony and a memorandum in regard to a matter which I consider to be of the greatest importance.

The testimony and the memorandum to which I refer will show in the future how correct Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg was in his testimony today before the Appropriations Subcommittee, where he stood firm in testifying that the United States should have proper and adequate air power.

I now request unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a copy of the testimony General Vandenberg gave to the subcommittee today, because the American people who read the RECORD should know of the necessity of our having a 143-wing Air Force, and should know the absolute necessity of having Congress provide for the proper air defense of the United States.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the testimony given today by Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, in his appearance before the Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following that testimony, a memorandum prepared by General Vandenberg in connection with his budget statement before the House Appropriations Committee, on March 6, 1953.

There being no objection, the testimony and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GEN. HOYT S. VANDENBERG BEFORE THE ARMED FORCES SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, JUNE 3, 1953

Three months ago, on March 6, 1953, I appeared before the Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. The purpose of my appearance there was to introduce the Air Force budget for the fiscal year 1954. The budget introduced at that time was designed to continue the buildup toward the 143-wing air force goal which had been fixed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, approved by the Department of Defense, and sanctioned by congressional action.

The statement I made before the House committee included a detailed review of enemy and friendly air strength. It provided a background of information which served to explain why an air force of at least 143 wings is an essential component of our worldwide resistance to Communist power. It stated that an air force of no less than 143 wings is the minimum force which can assure the ability of this Nation to resist successfully an all-out Communist attack.

In that statement I also expressed the hope that continued and uninterrupted progress toward an air force of this size and strength would deter the Soviet rulers from launching such an all-out attack against us.

An unclassified version of my statement was submitted to the House committee for its record. Since there has been no significant change in the facts there presented, or in my personal views, I am also submitting to this Senate committee the same statement and would appreciate its being made a part of this record. That will make it unnecessary for me again to go over the same ground.

In order to make my formal statement to this committee as brief as possible I have cast it in the form of answers to questions. I am aware that further elaboration may be necessary in some cases to clarify these issues, but I ask the privilege of completing this, my prepared statement, before answering other questions.

The first question: What is the origin of the 143-wing program for the Air Force? When and by whom was it established and approved?

Answer: Four principal events were instrumental in bringing about the formulation of the 143-wing air force:

The first was the exploding of an atomic bomb by the Soviet Union in September 1949.

The second was the Communist invasion of South Korea in June 1950, followed by the entrance of the Chinese Communist armies into Korea in November 1950—signifying the Communist intention to use armed might.

Third was the commitment of United States forces to assist in the defense of Western Europe.

Fourth, the calculation by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, based on our best available intelligence, that by the middle of 1954 the Soviet Union would be able to launch an all-out atomic attack against the United States.

The decision by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to recommend a 143-wing Air Force was not lightly made. Actually, the Air Force requested consideration of a 155-wing force consisting of 138 combat wings and 17 airlift wings. Although the Air Force requested a force of 155 wings, the Joint Chiefs of Staff agreed to recommend only 143 wings.

In saying that the Joint Chiefs agreed, I am saying that the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and I, as Chief of Staff of the Air Force, agreed to the 143-wing plan. All the arguments against, as well as for, an Air Force of this size were presented and considered by the

Joint Chiefs of Staff before a decision was reached. I want to emphasize the fact that the 143-wing Air Force was agreed to by all the services as necessary to the security of the United States.

There was a detailed analysis of the tasks and missions charged to the Air Force and a careful evaluation of the forces which would oppose us in the event of a general war in 1954 or thereafter.

The year 1954, I repeat, was considered critical principally because of the estimate that the Soviet Union will, by that time, have a stockpile of atomic weapons sufficient to mount a devastating attack on United States military installations, industry, and population centers.

The size and composition of the proposed force was based on an examination of all factors such as the buildup of our own atomic stockpile, the improvements to be expected in our own weapons and in the enemy's weapons, and the expected size, nature, and disposition of Communist military forces. There have been no significant or unexpected changes in weapons development or in forces since the decision was made.

Question. Have there been changes in the strategic situation that indicate the desirability of reducing the 143-wing program or delaying the date by which it is achieved?

Answer. There has been very little change in the strategic situation. There are many indications, however, that Soviet military strength and particularly Soviet air strength, has increased tremendously in recent years. The priority given by the Kremlin to the buildup of Communist air forces has achieved results.

Question. Did the Air Force or its Chief of Staff approve the reduction of the Air Force to an interim goal of 120 wings?

Answer. The Air Force did not, and I did not.

Question. Have the Joint Chiefs of Staff approved a reduction of the Air Force program from 143 wings to 120 wings, either on an interim or any other basis?

Answer. They have not. As recently as March 1953 the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated to the Secretary of Defense that any reduction of the program of 143 wings to be attained as soon as practicable after fiscal year 1954 would increase the risk to national security beyond the dictates of national prudence.

Question. Are there any strategic factors which either reduce the Soviet threat below what it was when the 143-wing program was established or which reduce the air forces required to meet that threat?

Answer. There are no such factors known to me. I know of no change in the strategy which the 143-wing Air Force was designed to enable us to carry out. Nor do I know of any alternate strategy designed to protect the security of the United States and its people which would not require an equal or greater Air Force than the 143-wing force toward which we have been building for 2 years.

Question. Would it have been possible for the Air Force to complete the 143-wing program by December 1955?

Answer. Six months ago our program of expansion and modernization was progressing in an orderly manner and there was no reason to doubt that we could attain 143 modern wings before December 1955. Base construction had already become a more serious bottleneck than aircraft procurement, but the solutions were in sight if we could have carried them out.

Question. Aside from the $5.1 billion budget reduction, has anything happened during the past several months to delay the progress of the Air Force toward its goals?

Answer. Yes. Much of the confusion as to the effect of the budget reduction arises from the fact that a great many other limitations have also been imposed upon the Air Force. The effect of all these limitations must be considered in order to fully comprehend the impact of the administrative and fiscal actions of the past few months. Five principal types of restrictions have been imposed which have in one way or another weighed heavily upon Air Force progress.

First, limitations on base construction. Early in February a restriction was imposed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense which prohibited the letting of all new construction contracts pending another review and clearance by that office. This action caused a 3-month deferment in contracts amounting to more than a half-billion dollars and a consequent slippage of that portion of our base program.

Another directive later in February placed a freeze on advertising for bids on construction projects. Of construction funds appropriated by the Congress and again certified as necessary by the Air Force, over half a billion dollars has not been released.

Second, personnel limitations. Early in February further hiring to meet new civilian personnel requirements generated by the Air Force buildup was prohibited, and on March 9 the Office of the Secretary of Defense required the Air Force to reduce its personnel by about 10,000.

Limitations on civilian personnel still in effect cause us to be short 93,000 of the number now required for the buildup toward 143 wings. More recently a ceiling has been placed on military personnel which requires the Air Force to reduce its uniformed personnel to a level of 20,000 below present strength within 2 years, despite the fact that we will organize and man new wings during that period.

Third, limitations on requests for appropriations. Requests for new appropriations for fiscal year 1954 are to be limited to $11.7 billion. This is the figure which receives the greatest amount of attention because it is the most readily understood. However, statements have recently been made by the Department of Defense that the Air Force will, after all, buy the combat planes for a 143-wing force—but without the other elements of such a force. If a plan such as this is to be carried out, some further adjustment of the budget figure will, of course, be necessary.

This decision to purchase the combat aircraft for 143 wings in a program limited to 120 wings plus the modernization of the Air National Guard and Air Reserve, leaves most of these airplanes without units, people, or bases, and the only alternative is to store them.

Fourth, limitations on expenditures. Money to be paid out next year, mostly from appropriations of previous years, has been estimated by the Department of Defense not to exceed $15.1 billion. At this moment we believe that an expenditure limitation above $16 billion is more realistic.

Very recently, however, other statements from the Office of the Secretary of Defense have indicated that the expenditure figure was supposed to be elastic, and that it may be changed. Obviously, a change will be necessary if more combat airplanes than those required for a 120-wing force are to be purchased as has recently been indicated.

Fifth, limitations on force levels. The strength of an Air Force is generally expressed in terms of wings. We have been directed to plan and to program toward a so-called interim goal of 120 wings instead of the previously approved goal of 143 wings.

I must apologize if the picture I have presented appears somewhat confused. The numerous and sometimes contradictory administrative and fiscal actions of the past few months have caused the greatest amount of uncertainty and confusion in the Air Force and among allied activities that has existed since the demobilization after World War II.

Question. What has been the effect on the Air Force program of the administrative and fiscal actions of the past few months?

Answer. What disturbs me most about these actions is the fact that a modern Air Force, being composed of many interdependent parts, can be seriously weakened through tampering with any of those parts.

An Air Force consists of three principal elements—people, planes, and bases. The people include many kinds of specialists and most of these require extensive training. The planes are of many types and they all require extensive support in the form of spares, repairs, and auxiliary equipment. Bases also are of several types in a variety of locations, and most of them require a long time to build.

A shortage in any one of these many elements which go to make up a modern Air Force may render the remainder of that force ineffective. To keep everything in gear and to enable the entire program to move forward on schedule and with economy requires a consistent and orderly progression to established goals.

Great waste occurs when a setback in one aspect of the program causes a delay in all the other aspects. Viewed in this light, it should be clear that any one major element of an Air Force program is just as important as any other and that so-called supporting elements cannot be sacrificed without crippling combat strength.

For example, it is possible to train mechanics after they are assigned to combat units instead of in schools where they ought to be trained. To do so will produce a paper saving of personnel at no loss in number to the combat unit. But it is an inefficient procedure and it actually lowers combat strength instead of increasing it, since it constitutes a drain on the combat capability of a unit which should be ready to go. Also, it is possible to complete the training of pilots after they have been assigned to combat units, but this again is wasteful and dangerously deceptive, because it means that the combat units are never quite ready for combat.

It is relatively easy to make adjustments of this character in an effort to save money but such adjustments can only cause waste and a further postponement of the goal.

At the present time the principal limitation is the latest manpower ceiling placed upon the Air Force which compels us to make reductions in supporting units that are just as vital to the combat elements as the roots of a tree are vital to its branches. Program schedules such as training rates and flying hours have been adjusted downward because of limitations in bases and manpower. For example, the pilot training rate will be held at 7,200 pilots per year instead of rising to 12,000.

Because of reductions in the manpower of supporting units and reductions in funds for maintenance and operations, the Air Force will fly fewer hours next year, with a greater number of wings, than it is flying this year. This inevitably means a reduction in maintenance standards and in standards of aircrew skill and experience.

In addition, there will be a heavy reduction in the total airlift which was planned to be available to all the Armed Forces of the United States.

The 120-wing force, under the new program, will not be as well supported as the 143-wing force under the old program.

Question. What will be the effect of the recent budgetary and fiscal actions on the planned combat strength of the Air Force?

Answer. The strategic Air Forces will lose combat wings, the tactical air forces will lose combat wings, and there will be a reduction

in those units which support the combat operations of the Army.

Question. When will the new restrictions have their greatest effect on the Air Force?

Answer. Some reductions—such as those in base construction, in civilian personnel for overhaul, repair, and supply activities, and in military recruiting—are already having their effects.

In general, however, the construction, fiscal, and manpower controls now being imposed will have their greatest effect in future years. In the discussion of the shorter lead times that can now be achieved as production advances, the necessary lead time for the production of trained people is too often overlooked.

For instance, if it should be decided next year that the Air Force will, after all, have 143 wings, it will then be impossible to recruit and train the personnel for such a force earlier than 1957.

The problem of providing trained personnel in sufficient numbers is particularly acute in the Air Force because next year we will begin losing large numbers of men, now skilled and experienced, who have joined us since the beginning of the Korean war.

When a force is reduced in size the quality becomes more important than ever, yet reductions in training facilities, units, equipment and personnel will damage the quality of our force as well as reduce its size.

There has even been a heavy reduction in funds that can be used for research, and for the development of planes and weapons of the future.

Question. Why does the Air Force need very large new appropriations when it already has $28.5 billion of unexpended funds?

Answer. If the Air Force could buy from the shelves of a store everything it needs it could spend its money as Congress provides it, year by year. But to have a jet bomber in 1956 we have to make a contract for it in 1953 or 1954.

Before we can make a contract for it we have an appropriation by Congress—which used to be called contractual authority and is now called obligating authority, terms which mean the same thing. The longer it takes to build an item of military equipment the longer in advance it has to be ordered. For every year between the date when it is ordered, which is the year of appropriation, and the date on which it is delivered, which is the year of payment, the money for this piece of military equipment is contained in unexpended balances. Of the $28.5 billion carried over from previous years, $25.2 billion represents actual contracts we have made; $3.3 billion represents funds for the procurement of items already planned and programed, for which no contracts have yet been let, None of this is new money which we can use again and no fiscal juggling can turn it into new money. It is money we have already earmarked for items that we will have to pay for when they are delivered.

Therefore, these unexpended funds are neither surprising nor especially significant, despite the attention that has been directed to them. They are a normal consequence of the manner in which funds are appropriated by the Congress for long lead time items.

Because of the long lead time involved in starting production on new model aircraft, the Air Force has not yet reached its planned force level.

The authorized programs of the Army and Navy have been substantially achieved. The Air Force program is two-thirds along the way. No sound military reason has been offered to explain why the Air Force buildup to the agreed force level is again to be delayed. Once again the growth of American air power is threatened with start-and-stop planning, and at a time when we face an enemy who has more modern jet fighters than we have and enough long-range bombers to attack this country in a sudden all-out atomic effort. Rather than reduce our efforts to attain air superiority over the Communists we should now increase those efforts.

In closing I want to emphasize that this country, if it is to have a chance for victory in any major war, must have an Air Force that is second to none.

Since 1948 I have served as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These views are respectfully presented to this committee with that background of experience. To the best of my knowledge they are also the views of all those experienced in modern air warfare.

HOUSE BUDGET STATEMENT BY GEN. HOYT S. VANDENBERG, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, MARCH 6, 1953

Since 1948 the situation I have had to report to you has not been a happy one. Not only has the Soviet Union—and the Communist world dominated by the U. S. S. R.—become more and more belligerent, but also more and more capable of damaging us and our allies.

We Americans are traditionally an optimistic people. The cold facts concerning Communist strength in the air have been heeded by members of this committee, but for many people it seems necessary to repeat again and again. There is always the hope that somehow Red power, and particularly Red airpower, will suffer an unpredictable decline.

There is always the half-believed rumor that perhaps our enemies are much weaker than all the evidence indicates. This tendency to optimism is a fortunate characteristic because it makes life among us happier in many ways. But it can lead to wishful thinking and to disaster if those of us who know the facts fail to state them repeatedly—even when we ourselves would like to forget them.

Ever since World War II it has been difficult to overcome skepticism about Communist industrial and military progress. The possibility of early success in atomic bomb manufacture by the U. S. S. R. was recognized as early as 1947.

Nevertheless, news of the first explosion in Russia caused great surprise. During the years that followed World War II the Air Force and other agencies commented often on Soviet aircraft production and particularly on the high performance jet fighters they were building. Yet news of the MIG–15 in Korea seemed to cause more surprise.

I venture to say that most Americans would be surprised even now to learn that the Soviets have already produced many thousand MIG–15's. They are still producing these formidable fighters at a tremendous rate. Lately we of the Air Force have been concerned about the rising number of Soviet twin jet light bombers known as IL–28's. Several hundred of these fast bombers have been produced and they present a formidable threat to our overseas positions and to our overseas allies. These jet light bombers have already been introduced into the Chinese air force and the number is growing rapidly. If committed in quantity against U. N. airfields, ports, and supply lines in South Korea these high performance bombers could quickly jeopardize our position there.

The Communist air threat in the Far East is a most serious one. This is true despite the brilliant success of a few Air Force fighter pilots against a very small percentage of the total number of Soviet-built MIG–15's.

From Communist bases on the coast of China, along the Yalu, and on the coast of Siberia, MIG–15's carrying external fuel tanks can range far beyond their present zone of activity. The new jet light bombers, now appearing in increasing numbers, have a radius of action that would permit them to operate across the Sea of China and the Sea of Japan.

The Air Force is proud of the record established by its Sabre-jet pilots, its fighter-bomber pilots, and its bomber pilots and crews in Korea. Nevertheless, we must not lose sight of the fact that the war in Korea has not as yet provided any real test of air power—ours or the enemy's.

Air power is indispensable to United Nations ground forces in Korea and it has kept down our own casualties in the face of suicidal opposition on the ground. But the situation in Korea is a special one such as never has occurred before and is not likely to occur again.

Because of the peculiar circumstances of the Korean war, which are familiar to all of us, neither side has made full use of its air power. We have not attacked enemy air bases and the enemy has not attacked ours. We have not attacked the sources of his reinforcements and supplies and he has not attacked ours.

Against the Chinese Communist air strength of more than 2,000 airplanes, the United States Air Force has committed about half that number. As yet, we have employed only a small percentage of these planes against the Chinese Communist air force. The great preponderance of our effort in Korea has been directed against the Chinese ground forces in North Korea.

Communist efforts to disrupt our attacks against these ground forces have cost them nearly 600 MIG–15's shot down, plus operational losses of at least an equal number. This is a serious loss and its represents the most expensive loss of Soviet equipment caused by the Korean war.

But the loss rate for MIG–15's is completely under Communist control. In the present situation they can avoid this loss entirely, whenever they desire, by simply keeping their planes north of the Yalu. They have made no sustained and desperate effort, as yet, to disrupt our own operations over Korea and it is clear that they are using that area principally for combat training. There are many evidences that large numbers of Communist fighter pilots are rotated in and out of combat.

They have made no effort whatever against our bases in Korea and Japan, despite their superior strength in aircraft. Their ability to damage us grows every day as they introduce more and more jet light bombers into the Chinese air force. While they have not yet used these jet bombers against us, there is no justification for assuming they will not do so at a time of their choosing.

The fact that we are in action in the Far East draws our attention there, but air warfare should never be discussed in terms of one theater alone. It is important to remember that an air war between great nations would be worldwide in scope, and air strategy should be studied on a globe rather than on a map.

Air warfare is global not only because of the range and speed of airplanes, but also because the features of geography that confine and restrict surface warfare do not affect the flight of airplanes. Thousands of airplanes can be concentrated over a very small area or dispersed over a very wide area in a few hours' time.

There can be no holding or fortifying of positions in the air. In a few weeks time the focus of air conflict can shift from one side of the continent to the other or from one continent to another.

In the air as on the ground Russia has internal lines of communication. The shifting of many ground units from Siberia to Eastern Europe or from Eastern Europe to Siberia would require many weeks of concentrated effort. But it is possible to shift thousands of combat aircraft from one end of Russia to the other in a matter of hours. The Soviets have already prepared an excellent system of bases which would make such transfers possible.

Nevertheless, there is a definite advantage to be gained by having an air unit already on the spot and operating where it will be

needed most when an all-out struggle begins. For this reason the deployment of Soviet tactical air strength is interesting.

In addition to the Chinese Air Force of more than 2,000 aircraft, the Russians have in the Far East a total of more than 5,000 tactical aircraft. At the other end of Russia there is a much larger number of Soviet tactical aircraft, most of which are near the NATO area. The significance of the large numbers of Soviet tactical aircraft facing Western Europe is apparent when we consider operating radii of many of these aircraft will permit them to cover most of that area. Communist MIG's, for instance, can reach Denmark and the low countries as well as northern Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece, and western Turkey. Their jet light bombers can cover England, France, Italy, Turkey, and most of the Mediterranean. The large numbers of these aircraft, together with high performance capabilities and the excellent base system already prepared for them, constitute as great a menace to the NATO nations as the Russian ground forces, and one which can be far more rapidly applied.

The flying time of a jet bomber from inside the Iron Curtain across most of Western Europe and the Mediterranean is just a little more than 1 hour.

As a matter of passing interest, this is one of the reasons why the Air Force was so anxious to get strategic bases in north Africa, near the Atlantic and beyond the range of most of the Soviet Air Force.

Another important element of the Soviet Air Force is the medium bomber force. It has the capability of carrying atomic bombs for a distance of 2,000 miles and returning to its bases. It can also deliver the atomic bomb through staging bases already prepared in Siberia and northern Russia to any target in the United States on a one-way mission.

Whether the Soviets are yet completely prepared to commit this force in a full-scale attack against the United States we do not know. But we do know that these planes can reach us. Note that, while most of the Soviet strategic Air Force is located in Europe, many are in the far-eastern area, despite the fact they are not now using them in the Korean war. The number of strategic bombers they have in the Far East is greater than the number we have in that theater at the present time.

The numbers of Soviet aircraft now deployed east and west are further evidence of heavy Soviet aircraft production during recent years. You will recall from my briefing last year that the Soviets built up this great preponderance of aircraft strength, far in excess of our own, over the years of 1947–48–49. That was a period when aircraft production in this country was severely restricted by limitations on the Air Force budget. The Soviets, however, are not content to rest on the lead they established during the years. Their production continues to increase.

The Soviets are moving rapidly toward a jet-powered air force and they are neglecting none of their basic elements of combat air power—air defense, long-range bombardment, and offensive tactical power. In the last—offensive tactical powers—the Soviets, with their new twin-jet bombers, are achieving a performance which is as great an advance over the old piston types as the MIG–15 was an advance over their old piston fighters.

The MIG–15, despite warnings, was a great surprise to most Americans. But the MIG–15 was a defensive airplane and has never been used against us offensively. The jet light bomber, on the other hand, represents as great a technical advance as the MIG–15 and it is far more dangerous to us since it is designed for offensive use against our planes on the ground, our bases, our troops, our support, and supply systems.

The most significant fact concerning the Soviet buildup over the past year is simply that it has continued substantially as expected. We can find some justification for encouragement, however, in the fact that new experimental models have been slow in making an appearance. It is possible that our technological lead in the design and production of jet aircraft can be maintained for a few years longer if we continue our efforts on the present scale.

On the other hand, the Soviets were extremely reluctant to reveal new models last year. They abandoned their former practice of parading test models in flights over Moscow. We have to admit the possibility that their latest developments are being tested in greater secrecy than ever before.

From other witnesses appearing before this committee you have heard a discussion of Communist ground forces and a discussion of Communist naval forces. You will also receive from these same witnesses an outline of the increase in our own ground and naval forces which is proposed in Army and Navy budgets for the fiscal year 1954.

You will be informed in detail concerning the proposed increase in the strength and effectiveness of the United States Air Force by succeeding witnesses for the Air Force.

This program of expansion is based on the target set for us last year—to build and maintain a modern force of 143 wings.

It was hoped originally that we could have 143 modern wings by 1954, but decisions based on other than military factors caused a postponement of the readiness date.

When we do attain the target level by December of 1955, we will have a force which was planned against our estimates of Soviet capabilities 2 years earlier than that date.

Since the decision for this postponement was made after a full consideration of the facts, we are now concentrating our efforts entirely on carrying it through with maximum effectiveness. It is important, however, to understand that 143 wings is a conservative estimate of the strength that is needed and that within this 143-wing force we have planned for only the top priority items.

We recognize that the people of this country will be willing to carry the heavy defense burden, which is so important for them to carry, only if they are fully satisfied that every dollar of defense money is being used to the best advantage. They must have reason to feel that the military establishment is being run with economy and with the highest degree of managerial competence. Economy and efficiency would, in any circumstances, be important objectives; in the present circumstances they are imperative.

In the operation of a military establishment the practice of economy has two aspects. One, economy in program planning, and, two, economy in program execution. It is the latter that usually attracts the most attention and is subject to the most criticism, but it is in the former that the greatest savings are to be had. It is in program planning that resources are specifically related to missions or tasks. Economy in this area means providing only for the performance of tasks that are absolutely indispensable and providing only the minimum amount of resources required to carry out these tasks effectively.

This is the appraisal of the situation which we have accepted in the Air Force as the basis for our planning and our operations. Throughout the preparation of this budget, economy has been the keynote. In a determined effort to eliminate any remaining excesses in the Air Force budget we have, in many areas, deliberately reduced our estimates below our calculated requirements.

The problem of what forces are required to provide only for the most essential tasks is continuously under study within the Defense Department. Last year the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after an exhaustive study of all the factors involved, recommended and the Secretary of Defense and the President approved, 143 wings as the minimum force required and funds for the first phase of the buildup were appropriated by the Congress. At the start of the fiscal year 1954 budget planning cycle, the Joint Chiefs of Staff again reexamined the force requirements and again recommended to the Secretary of Defense and the President the 143-wing force goal. This recommendation was approved, and the budget was prepared on that basis.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended to the Secretary of Defense and the President only the major force requirements. The Military Departments then developed the support forces and reserve requirements. These are, of course, subject to review by the Secretary of Defense and the President in connection with the budget estimates, and by the Congress in the making of appropriations. It is in the provision of the support forces, reserves, and in the allocation of resources that the United States Air Force has effected major economies. In the area of support forces we have deliberately programed a lesser number of units than our computations indicate as required. For example, we have eliminated the two development squadrons we originally planned for this program. We have similarly reduced the number of air depot wings programed.

We are using second-line equipment wherever possible in the equipping of our regular units, and we have provided only partial ground equipment for our reserve units. Except for six training wings for which no other aircraft were available, no first-line equipment is being provided for our reserve flying units. These will be equipped with second-line aircraft released as the regular forces are modernized. Lack of first-line equipment in the reserve units, of course, reduces the combat effectiveness of the Air Force as a whole. This is an additional risk which the Air Force has accepted for reasons of economy.

The Air Force has also achieved great economies in the manning of the forces. It was originally estimated that the 143-wing force would require approximately 1,700,000 military personnel. Last year, however, I instituted studies designed to reduce this figure to 1,210,000. Studies made during this last year indicate that we might be able to man the forces with this number without reducing the number of crews provided our combat forces. These are very real savings. The reduction from 1,210,000 to 1,155,000 reflects a detailed review of our tables of organization and tables of distribution. Our planned personnel increase is extremely low as compared with the programed increase in wings.

We have also deliberately lowered the level of flying activity planned for the 143-wing force. Each year we have found that the flying program is not met, for causes which cannot be anticipated, such as the grounding of a particular model of aircraft, fuel shortage, etc. We have faced this issue squarely and have discounted the total computed flying hours to take account of future program difficulties. This results in a significant reduction in funds requested for the maintenance and operation of the Air Force and provides a tighter budget.

Another area of major economies in program planning is in the provision of combat reserves. The Air Force should provide a reserve of aircraft sufficient to replace those lost in combat after D-day which cannot be replaced from post D-day production. Our calculations show a requirement of thousands of aircraft for this purpose. For reasons of economy, the Air Force has programed for only that small number of combat reserve aircraft which can be obtained without acceleration of production.

Another type of requirement, under the heading of war reserve, exists for such consumables as fuel, ammunition, and spares. A

sufficient reserve of consumables should be provided to permit the forces to operate from D-day until production catches up with consumption. Our calculations indicate that a stock sufficient for many months at wartime consumption rates would be required on the average. For reasons of economy we have programed only a few months, acknowledging the additional risk.

Finally, a reserve of combat crews should be provided to enable rotation after D-day. The number programed in this category does not meet the full requirement. This means that available crews will have to serve longer, thus reducing their chance of completing a tour to below the level deemed acceptable from a morale viewpoint.

Another area in which great economies have been made in planning the program has been in bases. Although the Air Force has been the target of much criticism on this count, major economies have been effected by the simple expedient of doubling up units on one base. Medium bomber bases, for example, have been planned to accommodate two wings per base. This is not the most desirable arrangement from a purely military point of view since our Strategic Air Command bases here and abroad will be a high priority target system for the enemy. We have decreased the overall cost of the medium bomber wing installations program but have also increased the margin of risk.

Although the Air Force has achieved significant economies in both the planning and the execution of its program, much remains to be done.

With respect to program planning, force requirements must be kept continuously under review. Changes in weapons systems and changes in the overall military situation must be promptly reflected in the composition of our forces. As we gain additional experience in the operation of the larger Air Force, opportunities for further economies in the allocation of resources to specific tasks may become apparent. These should and will be promptly introduced. Additional savings in the execution of the program will continue to be sought by better management practices and by even greater emphasis on economy and efficiency throughout all, and particularly the lower echelons of command. It is at the squadron and base level that the job is actually done, and it is here that day-to-day economies must be made.

Mistakes or failures in management and in the detailed execution of military programs are seldom decisive in warfare and they do not compare in seriousness with mistakes in planning or strategy. They may seem minor in each separate instance, but taken all together they can add up to a formidable sum. In times of peace, when basic plans and strategies are not subject to test, errors and inefficiency in management can become the principal source of annoyance and embarrassment as well as a drain upon resources.

Much official and public attention has been devoted to management problems in recent years, and in the Air Force we are attempting to capitalize on all of it. Not content with the employment of many recognized experts in management from business and industry to advise us, we have systematically trained our commanders and staff officers in the principles and practices of economy.

In discussing economy, I should like to register an objection—a very serious objection—against a false and dangerous standard that has been widely advocated in recent months. It seems incredible to me that anyone could propose to judge the efficiency and the effectiveness of a military organization by calculating the percentage of its men intended to manipulate weapons and to be subjected to enemy fire.

This kind of analysis entirely overlooks the fact that what counts in warfare is fire power, and that fire power is not necessarily proportionate to the number of men handling weapons.

The evolution of modern warfare has led from many men with simple weapons requiring little support to a few men with powerful weapons requiring a tremendous amount of support. Obviously, the more ammunition a man can deliver the more help he needs to keep him supplied with that ammunition—and to service his powerful but complex weapons. Judged by such a standard as the one to which I am objecting, Caesar's legions equipped with simple broadswords were far more efficient than any military force of modern times.

In every combat air squadron the men who remain on the ground are several times as numerous as those who take to the air in combat crews. But the men on the ground make possible the delivery of explosives that are far more effective than all the broadswords or muzzle loaders ever made. If we use any such misleading standard of measurement as the ratio of men firing weapons to those servicing weapons, we would find air forces, like all other military forces, getting less efficient every day.

The simpler the airplane, the more limited its range and the lighter its load of weapons. The primitive airplanes of World War I and the obsolete planes of World War II required fewer men on the ground, and they required many more men in combat crews to deliver the same load. They also had far less effect on the enemy.

It should be recognized without too much argument that more powerful planes and weapons are far more complex and require many more men to service them, supply them, and to provide bases for their operations. It is fortunate, rather than unfortunate, that the crews they require in the air do not increase proportionately and that the ratio of weapon handlers has declined steadily in recent years. The total effect on the enemy, however, has risen enormously.

It is necessary and desirable that we search continuously for new savings through better management and administration. But these efforts should not blind us to the fact that the greatest waste, by far, can result from mistakes in the composition or the employment of a military force.

The dominant question is whether or not we have chosen the strategy most likely to bring us victory in peace or in war. The second most important question is whether or not we are building, within the resources allotted to us, a combination of men and weapons and bases best designed to carry out that strategy. Besides these questions, problems relating to the economical management of our military resources may seem to be minor. Nevertheless, they are sources of waste and they involve sums that are large indeed in comparison with anything other than unwise or inadequate planning and strategy.

The greatest loss in the administration of the Air Force today is one that attracts far too little attention. It is the loss of trained men through failure to reenlist and through failure to extend tours of active duty.

The popular illusion persists that men enter military service to learn certain routine duties and to learn to fight, whatever that may mean. Actually, the Air Force is made up of highly trained technicians performing duties similar to those in the transportation or electronics industry, but performing them in the face of discomforts and dangers which no such industry could tolerate. Despite our most urgent efforts to retain trained men in the service, no more than one-half can be depended upon to remain beyond their terms of enlistment. As a result, we have to retrain what amounts to a new Air Force every few years, and our huge but efficient Training Command absorbs a high percentage of the resources allotted to us. Relatively small sums devoted to better pay, better housing, and more stabilized living conditions for these men would save us many billions in the long run.

The next greatest source of waste, in my opinion, has been the unfortunate fluctuation in our programs over the years that has caused so many expensive preparations to come to naught because of failure to follow through. I sincerely hope that no more of our scarce resources will be wasted in this manner and that the goals toward which we have been building at great cost over the past few years will not be abandoned.

Because of the nature of the equipment needed by a modern air force, there is no way to escape the necessity of implementing our program through decisions that have to be made years before their results materialize. In the case of planes that take 2 years to produce, a failure to place orders in 1954 means a failure of deliveries in 1956.

Decisions made with respect to the new obligational authority we are asking for today are really decisions with respect to the striking power of the Air Force 2 years and 3 years from now. That striking power is not a thing that can be adjusted to the country's defense needs by last minute decisions.

Fortunately, the same is true of enemy forces. What we have to do is watch the trend of developments in the Communist world and plan ahead to make sure that at no future point in time will our own strength be so low that Communist strength can overwhelm us.

Our greatest hope for peace or for victory is to invest our military resources exclusively in those programs and projects which will have the greatest influence on our enemy in restraining him from all-out war—and the greatest effect upon him if the restraint proves insufficient.

Our global strategy designed to contain Red aggression, deter all-out war and, in the event such a war is forced upon us, to assure the survival of the United States and its allies, has been discussed before this committee by earlier witnesses. However, some elaboration of the air power aspects may prove helpful in relating our 143-wing program to that strategy.

One of the consequences of the air-atomic revolution in warfare is that the initial blows in any struggle are likely to be the decisive ones. We can no longer count on having time, as we did in the last two wars, to mobilize our military resources after the fighting has begun. If Soviet industries, and airfields, and transport facilities were left intact while they struck with atomic weapons at those of the West, we would have no chance of ever meeting them again on anything like equal terms.

No matter how strong our air defense, we could not prevent them from getting through with enough bombs to do us enormous damage. That is why we need to have, also in instant readiness at all times, a strategic force of our own capable of doing more than equal damage to the warmaking capacity of our potential enemies. This is the assignment of our Strategic Air Command.

An attack by Soviet Russia on the United States or on any of our NATO allies would bring this ready force into action. Its job would be to deliver atomic bombs against those targets in enemy territory which are most vital to his military operations. I cannot begin to explain to you the amount of planning and organization that has been required to put us in a position to carry out this mission. Nor can any of us fully comprehend the power of destruction that new developments have created. The idea of our ever having to use it is horrifying to all of us. But if we did not have it as part of our Defense Establishment, we would be inviting the global war which we hope to prevent.

Our enemies need have no fear that we will be the first to start an all-out war. On the other hand, they know that they might be

rendered incapable of continuing a conflict. Until we succeed in working out a foolproof, enforceable system of worldwide disarmament, we must, however reluctantly, put our faith mainly in our ability to counterattack. We must maintain our strategic Air Force in whatever strength is necessary to make it an effective deterrent to aggression.

Should a war against the West be started by the Soviets, one of their first moves might be a large-scale sneak attack on our air bases, ports, industrial centers, and on other strategic targets in this country. Therefore, the Air Defense Command must be ready on a moment's notice to send up our interceptors to engage the attacking planes. We have been setting up radar installations to pick up enemy planes while they are still many miles away from our most vital targets. If the attack were made at night, as it probably would be, our interceptors would have to be able to locate the invaders in the dark. I need not stress how much would depend on the effectiveness of this operation, nor the importance of our having the best possible equipment to carry it out.

No less essential to our strategy is the Tactical Air Command. With the important part it has played in holding the Korean front you are familiar. It also has a place of importance in the scheme of defense against any attack that might be made in Europe. In spite of the revolution taking place in methods of warfare, the NATO allies must still be prepared to offer direct resistance to invasion by enemy ground forces.

Crippling air blows against sources of supplies and lines of communication would sap the power of invading armies. But in the time that would elapse before this effect was felt those armies could, if not effectively opposed, carry the war deep into the territory of our allies.

The purpose of our tactical air operations in Europe would be to assist in repelling any such attack as well as to resist superior enemy air forces. For us, as well as for our more vulnerable allies, the defense of the NATO area is a matter of vital concern, and the importance of the part which can be played in it by tactical air power is being increased by technological developments.

By readiness to counter an attack we do not mean that we should have in being all the forces needed to fight a war. We mean only those that are required to give us a clear advantage in the first round of such a war if it were forced upon us. The maintenance of forces for any other purpose is of lesser importance. If we could not protect ourselves against the first onslaught of an enemy equipped with atomic weapons, and deal him harder blows in return, there would be no second round in the conflict.

The Air Force which will be created out of the budget being presented to you today is not designed primarily for difficult but indecisive actions such as the war in Korea; it is designed primarily to guarantee the survival of this Nation and its warmaking capacity in the event of an all-out war, to destroy the warmaking capacity of an enemy in the event of such a war, and to provide the maximum possible assistance to our allies. I know of no other guaranty against defeat, and I know of no way by which all-out war might be averted other than through the creation of the Air Force which would be made possible by the adoption of this budget.

I want to conclude by saying just a word about the strategy which we would have to depend upon. Contrary to some opinions which have been expressed recently, that strategy is not particularly complex and it is not difficult to understand. Nonmilitary men sometimes use the term "war plan" when they really mean strategy.

A complete war plan is, of course, the detailed instructions for implementing strategy, and it runs into volumes of fine print. The hundreds of thousands of details are interesting enough, and are worthy of study by military men, but the complete exposition of one war plan would require far more than an entire session of Congress.

In any case, a nation such as ours can have no final and positive war plan since we do not propose to begin a war on our own terms. We will fight if attacked but we cannot be sure just how or where we may be attacked. Our plans consist of agreed courses of action to be taken in response to attack. They must be changed repeatedly, since our forces and those of the enemy are constantly being modified. Our strategy, however, which is the basis for all such plans, is relatively constant.

Misunderstandings which sometimes arise with regard to our global strategy, and especially with regard to the air strategy which we must follow, have often resulted from a lack of familiarity with the globe. Old-fashioned Mercator maps are very misleading when they are used to illustrate the geographical relationship between the United States and our potential enemy across the Pole.

A polar projection, on the other hand, shows the Soviet Union in its true geographical relationship to the United States. Let us consider this relationship as indicated on such a map, or on a globe. Obviously a much simpler military problem would exist if the Soviet Union had no satellites and we had no allies. Alaska would provide a point of contact between American forces and Russian forces, but because of Arctic conditions surface warfare in that area could scarcely take place on a large scale.

Long-range atomic warfare between the Soviet Union and the United States would be possible but except for our own heavy bombers, most of the missions would, at the present time, be one-way missions. Neither Alaska nor Siberia contains many profitable targets for air bombardment and only the extreme northwest corner of the United States is within two-way range of Soviet TU-4's flying from Siberia.

Since the peformance and range in aircraft is steadily increasing, we can expect that, after a few more years, direct, two-way atomic warfare between the United States and Soviet Russia would become possible on a decisive scale. In such an event the victory would go to the nation possessing the strongest and most effective weapons and the strongest and most effective air force to deliver those weapons at long range.

However, the simple strategic problem that would be presented by a direct conflict between the United States and Soviet Russia, if each stood alone, does not exist today and may never exist.

The true situation is best seen on a globe or polar projection showing the Soviet Union surrounded by its satellites and partially surrounded by allies of the United States.

The existence of the Soviet satellites provides us with a few advantages, such as the possibility of revolt, but also with some very serious problems. One of these problems, of course, is the Korean war.

On our side, the fact that we have allies creates some difficulty for us and at the same time provides us with a great opportunity. The burden we assume in protecting allies near the Iron Curtain is obvious. Most of these allies are even more vulnerable to all forms of Soviet attack than our own distant outpost of Alaska.

By providing aid and protection for allies in Europe and Asia, we save them from seizure by the Soviets and we save their human and material resources from exploitation by the Soviets. At the same time we greatly complicate our own strategic problem, because it becomes necessary for us to move our defense outposts near to the threat of the huge Red army and beneath the threat of the entire Soviet Air Force.

Only 5 percent of that air force consists of long-range aircraft and it is only to that 5 percent that the United States itself is directly vulnerable.

Our allies near the Iron Curtain, on the other hand, are vulnerable to most of the remaining 95 percent of the Russian Air Force. If we are to keep them as allies, we must help provide them with protection against ground and air attacks.

The Air Force has no choice, therefore, but to maintain bases and units overseas which are at all times ready for action. Except for Great Britain, none of our allies is alone capable at present of providing their own air defense. With the exception of the three larger nations in Europe, none is capable of manufacturing modern aircraft, or of operating and maintaining a modern air force.

Two nations which would probably be the first to suffer from Soviet air and ground strikes are Germany and Japan, neither of which has the beginning of an air force.

The present strength of the Soviet tactical air force in the West far exceeds the present total strength of all NATO air forces in Europe. The planes with which the NATO air forces are equipped are generally inferior to the Russian planes in quality. The disparity in numbers alone, however, is sufficiently disturbing.

The air situation in the Far East is even more serious, despite the fact that our principal stronghold there—Japan—is not directly accessible to land armies. We have assumed full responsibility for the air defense of Japan and we are at present somewhat limited in our ability to furnish this defense.

While there has been much discussion of relieving some of our own ground forces through the training and equipping of other ground forces in the Far East, there has been little discussion of any relief from United States Air Force commitments in that area. The training of local ground forces is not being matched by the development of local air forces. The Korean Air Force, for example, consists of just a few F–51 aircraft. Almost all of the necessary air cover and support for the expanding Korean Army must come from somewhere else and that, we must assume, means from the United States Air Force.

These are some of the problems created by the fact that we are determined to resist further extension of the Iron Curtain and by the fact that we must support the allies necessary to prevent such an extension. It is in the air that all these allies have the least capability to help themselves.

We have, however, gained one very great advantage from the fact that these allies are located so near the Iron Curtain. They provide us with the opportunity for strategic outposts of air power. Without these strategic outposts we would have great difficulty in delivering atomic bombs against the most important targets in Russia.

The areas inside Russia which contain most of the basic Soviet war industry are deep in the interior. The principal target area which is nearest the Iron Curtain is Moscow and it is nearly 1,000 miles by any possible approach from bases on land or sea. Small airplanes cannot operate over such a distance—not even light bombers can make it across the 1,000 miles to Moscow and back. Only medium and heavy bombers can cover this distance.

Targets in the famous Ural Mountain industrial complex, in the atomic weapons area on Lake Baikal, and in other principal centers of war industry are protected by even greater distances.

The Soviets could scarcely have placed these vital areas with more care. Even in friendly areas to the west and south, it would be unwise to build strategic bases near the 1,000-mile circle, because they would be under the shadow of the entire Soviet air force. It is most desirable, therefore, to have strategic bases more than 1,000 but less than 3,000 miles from the most important target areas in the Soviet Union.

Fortunately, our allies can provide us with the base areas we need. This gives us one

great advantage over the Soviet Union, which is unable to obtain base areas so near to vital targets in this country. The targets in this country which would most nearly correspond to the ones I have illustrated here would, of course, be New York, Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Washington. All of these are more than 3,000 miles from present Soviet bases.

Questions are often asked as to why we need overseas bases since we have the intercontinental B–36 and will have, in a few years, some jet powered intercontinental B–52's. It is true that these heavy bombers are capable of reaching most of the important targets in Soviet Russia from this continent. If we did not have strategic units already operating from overseas bases at the beginning of any future world war, we would have to depend almost entirely on a few hundred heavy bombers operating from the northeast and from Alaska. There are several disadvantages to this, in addition to the fact that most of China and southern Russia would be out of range.

Heavy bombers are very expensive and their numbers will always be limited. The long trips required could not be made as often and the routes of approach would all be from the north. Furthermore, our bases in Alaska have the disadvantage of being close to Soviet bases and, at the same time, far from most worthwhile Soviet targets.

The opportunities afforded us by overseas bases create a far more favorable situation. Heavy bombers can reach more targets and reach them more readily from such overseas bases as those in north Africa, Okinawa, while the far more numerous medium bombers—B–29, B–50, and B–47—from bases in Alaska, Japan, Okinawa, England, and north Africa can also reach principal Soviet targets without air refueling.

Of course, we will continue to need heavy bombers as well as medium bombers. Because of the high performance possibilities of the B–52 and its importance in the delivery of powerful new weapons, we will need them in increasing numbers. But our worldwide base system enables us to use to full advantage our medium bombers, which make up most of our strategic force.

It should not be assumed, however, that the worldwide deployment of our strategic force will involve the exposure of most of that force within easy range of Soviet air attack. It is necessary to operate from foreign bases during peace if we expect to be able to operate from them quickly in war. But it will still be possible for us to keep most of our medium and heavy bombers on bases in the United States.

In case of all-out war, as these units move out from the United States for the air campaign against the heart of the Soviet Union, the first strike of that campaign would already be under way. These strikes, if they must be made, would overshadow all the campaigns that ever have been fought on the face of the globe. The greatest land mass on earth would become one battlefield, with carefully spaced and carefully timed air units moving across it from many directions at once. This method of attack would require a worldwide control of men and planes far more complete than General Lee or General Meade could exercise over their 5 miles of battleline at Gettysburg.

Only an attack such as this, resulting from years of planning and preparation, could be carried out without staggering losses. At the same time it is difficult to conceive how such an attack, if carried out successfully, could leave any nation with the ability or the will to continue fighting a modern war.

This is the possibility that the Kremlin has to contemplate when it ponders the problem of when to begin world war III. In my opinion, no other consequence could possibly disturb them one-tenth as much or be one-tenth as effective an influence for peace.

Of course, the Soviets are improving their capability for a similar strike against us, even though handicapped by a lack of bases that are positioned as favorably as ours—bases that too few people in this country understand and appreciate.

The Soviets are also enlarging and improving their interceptor defense force. At the same time, we are increasing the capabilities of our own striking force to insure that we maintain our present lead and to insure that it can do the job that may be required of it. That is one of the most important goals toward which the proposed Air Force budget is designed to move.

In summary, the strategy which your Air Force can and must follow in any major war is first: to provide all possible protection for the people of the United States, for the military forces of the United States, and for those vital installations and industries which are the basis of our strength. Second: to provide all possible aid and protection for allied nations to whom our assistance is pledged and whose assistance will help to bring us victory in any world struggle. Third: through carefully coordinated attacks by well-deployed forces of long-range bombers to deliver powerful weapons against those forces and installations within the country of the enemy that are most vital to his hope of success.

I need not emphasize that to be able to succeed promptly in this third objective is practically to insure that with the aid of our other forces, the first and second objectives will also be accomplished. The deployment of forces for carrying out these objectives, the types and sizes of the forces which will be required, the weapons which would be used, and the state of training and readiness which we must maintain are all reflected in our proposed budget.

Witnesses for the Air Force who are scheduled to follow me will explain in detail what these forces are, how they are trained and organized, and how the funds requested in the budget are to be applied to these ends. I am sure there will be many detailed questions raised throughout the hearings. The more questions the better.

I hope you will address to me any questions you now have concerning the strategy of defense which is the basis for all our plans and preparations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I express my very real appreciation to the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me so courteously.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have been glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina, because we love him so much that even if another Senator was in the midst of presenting a funeral oration, if the Senator from South Carolina were to request that he be allowed to interrupt, an interruption by him would be welcomed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I know the senior Senator from Illinois loves the Air Force as much as I do, and thus it is that I have requested that he permit me to ask unanimous consent to have these matters printed in the body of the RECORD.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 4, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3 (legislative day of May 28), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Amos J. Peaslee, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia.

PATENT OFFICE

Arthur Wilbur Crocker, of Maryland, for the position of Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Edwin A. Leland, Jr., of Louisiana, to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

James P. Winne, of Hawaii, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, T. H.

John A. Stanek, of Illinois, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill.

Theodore H. Lyons, of Louisiana, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lillian A. Arslanian
Sara N. Brown
Barbara A. Conard
Ellen M. Uren

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art our creator and benefactor, may our lives during this new day be filled with the very best things.

Help us to realize that there is no time in it for anything except the doing of good and a sincere effort to be good.

We pray that in the realm of human relationships, now so tense and troubled, mankind may learn the wisdom of putting into practice the Golden Rule.

May we listen in on the life of one another with attitudes of sympathy and considerateness, of kindness and good will.

Show us how we may bring cheer and encouragement to all whose workaday world is dull and drab. May we enable them to find the secret of joyous living and the fulfillment of their fondest hopes.

Hear us in the name of our Master who went about doing good. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution rescinding the action of the Speaker in signing S. 1550, relative to the wearing of service

uniforms by veterans, and requesting the return of papers by the House.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 53–9.

TRUTH IS OUR WEAPON

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in view of the President's message last Monday on his plan to reorganize, among other things, the Voice of America and other information programs, I think it appropriate to call attention of the Congress to a new book on this general subject which will be issued June 15 by the Funk & Wagnalls Publishing Co.

The book was written by Edward F. Barrett and is titled "Truth Is Our Weapon." I have just read a preedition copy of this book and can recommend it as factual, thoughtful, and informative. To any Member of the Congress interested in the subject of our international information problem this book is must reading.

Mr. Barrett is perhaps better qualified to write such a book than almost any other American. He was former Administrator of the Voice of America and during World War II served as a top executive in the Office of War Information. His long career as a newspaperman displays itself in the readable manner in which he has prepared his material.

Any person who reads this book will have a better knowledge and understanding of the Nation's as yet unsolved problem of carrying on an effective and proper campaign of propaganda and information to the world.

Whatever program our Government adopts must first be approved by the Congress. Hence, it goes without saying that the better the Members know this subject, the better the program will be. None can be too well informed on this problem. The tremendous research work and effort made to prepare the material for this book attests its reliability. In my opinion, it is the finest text on the subject yet written.

Since I am perhaps the only Member of the House who has actually served in overseas propaganda work, I believe I am somewhat qualified to know this subject and to recommend a book dealing with it.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports and resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill (H. R. 5471) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the engrossed copy be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, segregation on account of color or race in the District of Columbia is indefensible under our Constitution. The expression of President Eisenhower's support for the elimination of segregation in the Nation's Capital was properly hailed widely, and its implementation will be a great thing for our country at home and in the eyes of the world. There are some measures to eliminate segregation in the District Government which can be taken by the Commissioners and these I have already urged upon them. Other measures to eliminate District of Columbia segregation must be taken by the Congress. In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1953, I inserted a study of laws affecting the District of Columbia which in effect provide for segregation. I shall continue in every way, by action on this bill and otherwise, to join in the effort, which must be unremitting to end segregation in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NORRELL. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves to recommit the bill H. R. 5471, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1954, to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOUNTAIN moves to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of House Resolution 236, to declare that the House does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1953 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 25, 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from North Carolina in favor of the resolution?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 48]

Barden	Kee	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Kelley, Pa.	Regan
Brooks, La.	Lesinski	Richards
Broyhill	Lovre	Rogers, Colo.
Bush	Lucas	Sheppard
Crosser	Lyle	Short
Dawson, Utah	Martin	Shuford
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	Sikes
Grant	Miller, Kans.	Small
Hagen, Minn.	Miller, N. Y.	Sullivan
Heller	Morrison	Vinson
Herlong	Moulder	Withrow
Jackson	O'Neill	Yates
Jarman	Perkins	Young
Jones, Mo.	Reece, Tenn.	Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 383 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was granted permission to address the House on tomorrow for 1 hour, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered, on the subject of Veterans' Administration appropriation.

AMENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4495) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree with the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SHORT, ARENDS, COLE of New York, KILDAY, and DURHAM.

RETURN OF BILL TO SENATE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives in signing the enrolled bill (S. 1550) to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom be, and it is hereby, rescinded, and that the House be, and it is hereby, requested to return to the Senate its message announcing its agreement to the House amendments.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I had hoped that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations would call together our committee for consideration of the evidence taken at our hearing for debate on Reorganization Plan No. 2 and for a vote either favoring or rejecting House Resolution 236, which I introduced on May 14. Not only did I expect this to be done, but I requested such of the chairman of our committee. He has refused to call the committee together for such consideration, debate, and action. I know of no other way to enable the Members of this House to consider this plan and to act upon it than by the motion which I have just made to discharge the Committee on Government Operations from further consideration of House Resolution 236.

I would like to preface my remarks upon this motion and my later remarks in support of House Resolution 236 with this statement: I know of no Member of Congress who supported with more enthusiasm than I did the extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949. When I supported extension of that law, I did so with high hopes and great expectations that the President of these United States in all of his reorganization proposals would tell you and me what he proposed to do. Maybe that is one of the weaknesses of a new Member of Congress—to have high hopes and expectations. As I read the Reorganization Act of 1949, the extension of which I supported, I sincerely felt that I would have an opportunity to study true reorganization plans. If Reorganization Plan No. 2 is an example of what we may expect to continue to receive from the President, I am greatly disappointed. It goes without saying that I am disappointed that this particular plan does not, at least, in a general way, do what I believe the Reorganization Act requires.

Before going into a discussion of my objections to this sweeping grant of power to a nonelected official, a grant of power far in excess of that which Congress has heretofore seen fit to give even to the President of the United States, I want to tell you why I introduced House Resolution 236.

I was disappointed in Reorganization Plan No. 1. However, that plan was far more specific than this plan, and it did have a proviso in section 7 thereof "that no professional or substantive function vested by law in any officer shall be removed from the jurisdiction of such officer under this section." After that plan was approved by this body, I began a study of the Reorganization Act of 1949, which we extended, and then when Reorganization Plan No. 2 was proposed, I read and studied it carefully, together with the President's message submitting it, and then reread it and restudied the Reorganization Act. I became greatly concerned about this plan. I did not want to take upon myself the responsibility of introducing a disapproving resolution. As a result of informal discussions by the members of our Committee on Government Operations, while in session, I thought that our committee would have informal hearings on the plan, call in Mr. Benson, the new Secretary of Agriculture, and others, so that we might find out just what this plan would mean ultimately and what its effects would be. We never had such an informal hearing. Time was passing rapidly. I kept thinking that a senior Member of this body would introduce either a resolution of disapproval or a resolution of approval, which would require consideration by the appropriate committee. I continued to study the plan and the Reorganization Act. The more I studied it the more convinced I became that it should not become law, at least until it had been carefully considered by the appropriate committee. I, therefore, introduced H. R. 236, so that the matter could be considered by the appropriate committee and finally by the Members of this body. My mind was not closed against the plan, but it was sufficiently strong against it to convince me that such far-reaching legislation, prepared and submitted by one outside of Congress, even the President, granting such unlimited authority to another outside of Congress, a nonelected official should not become the law of this land by default. It appeared to me that it would be a dangerous precedent to passively approve such legislation.

Let me say here also that my introduction of this resolution was completely nonpartisan. I did not ask for, nor receive, a single commitment in support of it before I introduced it; nor did I contact a single member of the minority committee on the Committee on Government Operations to get their views. So, whatever may be the purpose of anyone else in supporting or opposing this resolution, and, consequently, in supporting or opposing Reorganization Plan No. 2, I introduced it on my own for the reasons which I have already mentioned. I do not at this moment know how more than 3 or 4 Members of this body will vote on this motion.

Now, why have I made this motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of this resolution? I have done so primarily because the committee has not acted upon it. Neither the committee, nor those of us at the hearing representing the committee, have done anything other than to question witnesses and listen to testimony. The plan has not been carefully considered by the full committee or by a subcommittee. And even should we assume that it has been considered by the members individually, there has been no collective action resulting in a recommendation by that committee to this House.

It is my feeling that the primary reason for the unusual provision contained in section 204 of title II of the Reorganization Act, providing for a highly privileged motion to discharge the committee, is to enable the Members of this House and of the Senate to give consideration to, and to engage in debate upon, and to take action on reorganization legislation which the appropriate committee refuses to act upon, or has acted upon unfavorably. Regardless of my personal views on this plan, I cannot conceive of any Member of this body, who believes in the principle of open and free discussion, objecting to the discharge of the committee considering H. R. 236 so that this body may take action which has not been taken by the committee and either defeat or pass this resolution of disapproval upon the floor of this House. Regardless of its outcome, if this plan is debated on the floor of this House, we can truly feel that this body has given it due consideration and has taken that action which it feels is appropriate. This matter should be debated on the floor of this House. That will not happen unless this motion to discharge the committee is passed. No legislation completely surrendering the authority of Congress over an executive department of this Government should become the law of this land until this body, in keeping with the American tradition, has given it careful consideration. In my opinion, such has not been done to date by enough Members of this House to justify accepting this so-called plan for reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. If I were to request a show of hands at this point, or even after the brief period for debate on this motion, as to how many Members of this House have studied this plan and the spirit and the intent of the Reorganization Act, I wonder how many could conscientiously raise their hands and say "I have."

All I am asking you to do is to thrash this matter out on the floor of this House. If, in your wisdom, you should decide to ask the President to submit another, and more specific plan, you can do so. If you are satisfied with the plan he has submitted, you can say so. Your vote to discharge the committee would not necessarily mean that you oppose plan No. 2.

Now, what is this so-called Reorganization Plan No. 2? It does substantially what Reorganization Plan No. 4 of the second session of the 81st Congress did and that plan was soundly rejected by the Senate with a nonpartisan vote. I submit that the heart of this whole plan No. 2 is identical with the 1950 plan No. 4 which was condemned by both Repub-

licans and Democrats alike as a blanket abdication of the power of the Congress. I am told that in the Senate there was scarcely a dissenting voice raised when plan No. 4 was rejected.

Let me read into the RECORD the pertinent portion of both plans, which is found in section 1. Section 1 of plan No. 4 of 1950 is as follows:

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions of all other officers of the Department of Agriculture and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

Now, here is what plan No. 2 of 1953 says:

Subject to the exceptions specified in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him of all other officers and all agencies and employees of the Department of Agriculture.

The only difference between those sections is that one uses the word "except" and the other uses the word "subject." Both of them are subject to the same objections that were made to plan No. 4 of 1950—that it was too sweeping a grant of congressional power of unlimited duration to a nonelected public official.

In the hearings before the Senate committee in 1950, witnesses who opposed plan No. 4 called it "unbridled grant of power." It was objected to because it did not conform to the report of the Hoover Commission because the proposed reorganization was being sought before the Department knew the nature of its long-range farm program for agriculture in this country. Does the Department know that now?

I was astounded to discover the names of some of those who opposed plan No. 4 in 1950 who are favoring the same grant of authority in 1953. Our committee hearings disclosed that two of the strongest opponents of this unlimited grant of power in 1950 will occupy the two positions of assistant secretaries which this plan No. 2 proposes to add. They are Mr. John H. Davis, who appeared before the Senate committee in 1950 as executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the Honorable Romeo E. Short, another top official of the Department of Agriculture, who appeared in 1950 in opposition to plan No. 4 as the vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. These are two of the officers to whom, I assume, a good portion of the Secretary's unlimited authority will be delegated.

What did Mr. Davis, the Assistant Secretary to be, have to say in 1950 about plan No. 4? On pages 38 to 40 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments in 1950 is found the following statement of Mr. Davis:

We feel that it leaves too much open to discretion and too much latitude for the people who are carrying it out. * * *

At the present time our basic agricultural policy is more or less of a state of flux. The farm plan that will be the basic structure for the next several years is not definitely crystallized. There are various plans that are up for discussion and it seems to us that it is very difficult and unwise to try to reorganize the Department until we know what kind of farm plan the Department is to carry out.

I think we will know much more about the shape of our farm policy within a few months, and the reorganization should be geared to the evolving farm policy. We do not think now is a good time for a reorganization to take place.

We feel further that Congress should assume the responsibility for the laying out of the general outline of organization at the time Congress lays out the general outline of basic farm policy.

The other point that I want to make is this: Within the Department of Agriculture there are a number of strong, well-organized agencies. They are agencies that are set up to carry out important functions. The people that are heading those agencies and that are working in those agencies are most of them very sincere people, but it is only human nature for a person to think that his particular task and his particular agency is the most important. The result is that whenever a reorganization takes place in the Department—and they are fairly common—it is more or less a matter of rivalry among agencies as to which particular program and agency will be dominant. I think that any future reorganizations will pretty much suffer from the same type of pressure from within the Department. This being true, it seems to us that it is going to be very difficult for any Secretary of Agriculture—and this is no reflection upon any particular Secretary of Agriculture—to build and put into effect from within the Department the outline of a sound reorganization.

That is further reason why we think that the general pattern—the overall pattern—should be laid down by Congress. * * *

The thing that we object to most is that plan No. 4 turns over to the Secretary the whole job of reorganization, and then it provides that if after experimentation with such plan it does not work, he is free to reorganize it again as he sees fit.

We think that the task of organizing or reorganizing the Department of Agriculture is so basic for the welfare of the farmers and so much a part of the overall farm policy that that job ought to be done by the Congress. * * *

We oppose plan No. 4 because it turns over the whole job of reorganizing and determining the center of emphasis within the Department to the Secretary. If I were Secretary I certainly would prefer to have Congress outline the organization structure, rather than attempt to do it myself.

Now let us see what Mr. Romeo E. Short, another Assistant-Secretary-to-be, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, in 1950, had to say on pages 50–51 of the same hearings:

Reorganization plan No. 4, submitted by the President on March 13, constitutes a general grant of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture, without direction or guidance to him to carry out any phase of reorganization recommended either by the Hoover Commission or its task force on agriculture. Since it is without guide or direction, we regard the plan as an unwise grant of general authority and power.

Reorganization plan No. 4 is really not a plan. A plan should have recommendations, framework, and structure. Plan 4 does not have these. It is therefore not a plan. * * *

We would like to call attention to the fact that the United States Department of Agriculture is a very large department; its agencies reach into every State, into every community and into every county, not with just one program, but with several. If, in the future, effort was made to misuse this extensive administrative organization, the ill effects or the disadvantages of centralized government might be much more noticeable in an organization of this kind than in some of the other administrative branches of government. We would like to call attention to the fact that the legislative history of the Reorganization Act indicates that the reorganization plans submitted to Congress would be in some detail, so that the Congress would know, and everyone else would know something about the direction the reorganization was taking. Reorganization plans are supposed to go into considerable detail, thus enabling the Congress to have some check on authority granted in the Reorganization Act.

Therefore, we want to again say that by reason of the fact that plan No. 4 is really not a plan—just a grant of authority without congressional check—we feel it should be rejected.

Another leader on the legislative counsel of the National Grange, Mr. J. T. Sanders, opposed plan No. 4. On page 35 of the same hearings we find his statement, which is as follows:

We trust the Senate will reject plan No. 4 for reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. It grants to the Secretary of Agriculture practically complete authority to reorganize any of the agencies in the Department in any way he sees fit without regard to the expressed wishes of Congress or the expressed recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The theory that we should place full responsibility on an executive and then hold him responsible to get favorable results is merely theory when applied to governmental operations of this kind and does not work out in practice. * * *

The only way to avoid the possibility of such abuse is for the Congress itself to lay down in the law the broad course it desires to be followed in the administration of the law. Plan No. 4 would abolish all these safeguards and policies and give the Secretary power to do anything he wanted. We feel this is a most dangerous grant of power.

In addition, on page 91 of the hearings before the same Senate committee, there is a list of State Farm Bureau federations from 30 States who opposed plan No. 4. I do not know what the positions of those federations are now.

In my study of the report of the Senate committee on Reorganization Plan No. 4, of 1950, I ran across the following statement of Mr. H. P. Rusk, dean of the College of Agriculture of the University of Illinois, who stated that the Hoover Commission task force, in studying the operations of the Department of Agriculture, "soon found that a well-coordinated organization could not be secured by merely shuffling the existing units"; that Reorganization Plan No. 4 "offers no directive in support of any efforts the Secretary may make toward adoption of the basic administrative grouping of functions recommended by the Commission." Dean Rusk then pointed out that—

The record of a previous attempt during the years to secure a more effective, economical organization of this and other departments of the executive branch of the Government shows that the absence of specific directives places the Secretary in a very weak position with respect to vested interests in and outside of the Department. He then concluded: "We, as former members of the Agriculture task force, believe that Reorganization Plan No. 4 should be rejected, and that specific directives should be provided by the Congress to effectuate the basic principles and recommendations of the Commission. I am advised that legislation is now being prepared to accomplish this objective.

I also understand that Mr. True Morse, former president of the Doane Agricultural Service, likewise opposed plan No. 4 for similar reasons. Where is he now?

He is the Under Secretary of Agriculture. Others, too numerous to mention, including Mr. William Rhea Blake, executive vice president of the National Cotton Council, and 7 of the 8 members of the Hoover Commission task force, which Dean Rusk was representing when he spoke, opposed an identical grant of authority in 1950, to a nonelected official without the veto authority of Congress.

I cannot find at any place any testimony, by former President Hoover in support of plan No. 4, when another political party was in power. I understand that he, Dean Rusk, Mr. Davis, Mr. Short, Mr. Morse, and others I have already mentioned, favor plan No. 2 of 1953. What prompted all of these gentlemen to change their minds? What have they discovered about this plan that will take it outside of the broad objections they raised to it in 1950? What do they say in substance? Oh, they say that plan No. 2 carries important limitations on the Secretary's authority that were not in the plan of 1950. It adds one more exemption—the Farm Credit Administration. Mr. Benson said there were dangers involved in transferring those functions to him. It makes certain that unexpected funds which are transferred, as functions are transferred, may be used only for the purposes for which such funds were originally appropriated. They say also that this plan provides that any change must have as its purpose the simplification and increased efficiency of Department operations; that administration of farm programs must be placed close to State and local levels and that the administration of such programs must be adapted to meet local needs. Then they emphasize, as a last limitation, the requirement of advanced public notice, and hearings on any proposal for major reorganization or changes "to the extent deemed practicable by the Secretary."

Now I am frank to admit that the provisions dealing with unexpended funds and exempting the Farm Credit Administration are improvements over plan No. 4, but the remainder of the so-called limitations are nothing more than what Senator RUSSELL described as "window dressing." Is the Secretary of Agriculture not impliedly obligated to do these other things; to seek to simplify and make efficient the Department's operations and to give interested persons and groups an opportunity to be heard? However, note that there is nothing mandatory about the so-called public hearings. Note also that there is no provision including Members of Congress under the term "interested persons"; and even if each and every secretary of Agriculture from now on out were to do what the present Secretary of Agriculture said before our Committee he would do—consult Members of Congress before making any major changes—is there anything binding on him? If he disagrees with the Members of Congress whom he chooses to confer with, is he not free to use his own judgment notwithstanding that expressed by Members of Congress?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of this House, that there is nothing in Reorganization Plan No. 2 to take it outside of the argument which was so capably made by the aforementioned parties against Reorganization Plan No. 4, of 1950. I submit that the changes included in plan No. 2 are minor in character and there is nothing in the plan that such changes as the Secretary of Agriculture might make must meet with the approval of those that are effected or anyone else. There is no appeal from his decision. There is no way on earth for the farmers of America, or Members of Congress, who might disapprove of something which the Secretary wished to do under this plan, to enforce their demands.

I stated earlier that I had studied the Reorganization Act, which we recently extended. I have studied it carefully. I have studied plan No. 2. Plan No. 2 does not offer a single specific proposal for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture, nor does it, in my opinion, offer a single proposal which complies with the spirit and the intent of the Reorganization Act. I believe it was the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act that this Congress should at least know the general form the Department is to take, after reorganization is had, before it approves a reorganization plan. I admit I am more satisfied now as to what the present Secretary of Agriculture does not intend to do than I was before our hearings. At least, it is some satisfaction insofar as the present Secretary is concerned, to have him say that he would not do certain things, but at no place in his testimony does he tell us what he proposes to do with this unlimited grant of authority. On page 107 of the House record of hearings by our committee, I asked Mr. Benson this question:

> Now, if you do not have anything in mind, or in such a tangible form that you feel you could present it, would you have objection to preparing the framework of such a plan or plans from time to time at least in such reasonably specific terms that they could be clearly understood by the Members of Congress, giving them an opportunity to reject or accept the plan.

Here is Mr. Benson's answer:

> I tried to make clear in my statement, Mr. Congressman, that as I look at this, it is a continuing thing. It isn't something you can do today and say, "The job is done. This is the plan." As we move forward, we will have to continue our study, and I agree fully with the statement that was made back in 1937, which I quoted—that it is not possible to make a blueprint once and for all and say, "This is the job we're going to do." We can set forth some broad objectives, some broad principles, and work toward those objectives; but it must be a continuing job, as I view it. Now, we've only been in office, as you know, a short time; but we've already found from week to week some of the things that have come to our attention which need adjusting in the interests of efficiency and more effective administration. Now, I expect as the months ahead pass by we'll find other things that need our attention. I wouldn't feel that I could make out any definite blueprint once and for all, today or in the immediate future. I think this is a thing that will have to be continued—this study—and we will have to follow in line with what the studies reveal.

I submit that if the present Secretary of Agriculture does not know now why he wants such a broad grant of authority he should study his Department a little bit longer and submit to Congress from time to time such reorganization proposals as he deems necessary and advisable in the interests of economy and efficiency. He does not have to do all of his reorganizing at one time. If he sees where one phase of reorganization is important, he can very easily prepare an order for the President to send to Congress, as stated in the act. The Congress can then approve his plans in piecemeal until April 1, 1955. Under this plan, the President is, in effect, repealing the time limit of April 1, 1955, set forth in the Reorganization Act, as the time for submission of reorganization plans, and enacting new legislation giving the Secretary of Agriculture, whomever he may be, at whatever time, in the future, to do his own reorganizing, without the opportunity of Congress to approve or disapprove. Is that the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act? Quoting Senator RUSSELL:

> If we accept a proposal of this kind, giving this permanent and unlimited power, without having the slightest idea as to what is going to be done with the functions of the Department of Agriculture, the Congress might as well shut up shop and go home, as far as agricultural legislation is concerned.

I might modify that statement by saying "except for appropriations." And even that, with statutory functions, enacted into law by Congress, transferred to the Secretary and from the Secretary to certain officers or agencies, I wonder if Congress will still be in a position to appropriate with accuracy?

I might say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that I am impressed with the sincerity of the present Secretary of Agriculture. I have no reason to doubt that he has honest intentions. My opposition to this plan in no way involves personalities, for ours is a Government of laws and not of men.

I do not believe it is the intent and spirit of the Reorganization Act to give to a Secretary of Agriculture, whoever he may be, such a delegation of authority on a permanent and continuing basis, without restraint or restriction as to how or when it would be exercised.

This plan enables him to take action which could, in effect, destroy the will of Congress, as expressed in basic legislation outlining the various functions of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture. He, or the one to whom he delegates authority could transfer important services now performed by traditionally accepted agencies within the Department to other agencies of his, or his subordinate's, personal preference. He could take action which might injuriously affect matters of substantive policy, adopted by Congress after many years of study. The present Secretary of Agriculture does not deny that this plan gives him such authority. He sim-

ply says he needs adequate authority to carry out his responsibility.

While the plan attempts to carry out the Hoover recommendations for establishing a line of authority from top to bottom, it admittedly leaves out at least nine of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. The statement that it simply gives him a blank check to reorganize, at his pleasure, and at his will, all of the far-flung activities of the Department, excepting those agencies and offices exempted, is true. It is definitely a plan without a plan.

I would like to ask this question of the members of this House: Is there one of you who has the slightest idea as to what will be done by the present Secretary of Agriculture, or any other secretary, with the various functions of the Department of this plan? Which of the functions will be magnified? Who among the officers, or which of the agencies will be given greater power? Which function or functions will be subordinated or stifled, or even possibly eliminated? All of these are questions of major importance to the people of America, especially the farmers, and I truly believe that Congress is entitled to an answer to these questions before we acquiesce in such a broad grant of authority. Agriculture is basic to the lives of our people. Millions of Americans, on the farms and in the cities, are affected by decisions of the Secretary of Agriculture or his subordinates.

Just this week, the farmers in my district in North Carolina, largely in Northampton and Bertie Counties, sustained from a destructive hailstorm damages roughtly estimated at over $1½ million and affecting from 1,100 to 1,200 families. From 8 to 10 thousand acres of cotton, 10 to 12 thousand acres of corn, and approximately 900 acres of tobacco were destroyed or damaged in that area.

This is just one example of the trying and distressing experiences our farmers have from year to year. Fortunately, they are eligible for disaster loans. I make mention of this disaster to emphasize that these are some of the millions of families affected by agricultural legislation and decisions of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Down through the years Congress has developed agricultural policies and programs that have played a great part in the prosperity and well-being of the American farmer. Safeguards, such as disaster loans in situations like the above, have been erected against many of the hazards that brought about the farm depression of the twenties and the thirties. Are we going to abandon our power and our responsibility completely? As I understand it, functions are created by Congress. Congress ought to know in advance what is going to be done with those functions.

Do you believe it was the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act to permit the President to get around the April 1, 1955, deadline, by transferring to the Secretary of Agriculture the unlimited powers of permanent duration to reorganize, and to shift and to shuffle, whenever and wherever he chooses, without the authority of Congress?

Let me get back to one of the major objections I raised to this plan, that it violates the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act. Can any one of you read the President's plan and discern any reorganizations of the Department of Agriculture? Can you find anything in the plan which tells what the Secretary of Agriculture shall do with respect to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Farmers' Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Office of the Solicitor, the seven agencies which the Secretary contends this plan will affect? Is there any Member of Congress who knows what will happen to any one or more of the functions of those respective agencies or of any other agencies which now have their functions by statute, after they are transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture? Did you know that under this plan all functions of all agencies will reside in the Secretary of Agriculture and that until he redelegates, no other officer, employee, or agency of the Department will have any functions? Do you believe such was contemplated by the Reorganization Act? Let us go to the Reorganization Act itself and see what it says. Section 8 of the act reads as follows:

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act the term "reorganize" means any transferring, consolidation, coordination, authorization, or abolition, referred to in section 3.

Now, in that section you have the definition of reorganizations but the reorganizations contemplated by that section are dependent upon the content of section 3. Now, section 3 gives a list of six types of findings or reorganizations which the President is authorized to make. Mr. Loos, the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, says that item 1 of section 3 is the pertinent finding in this plan. Now let us read that portion of section 3 which is pertinent:

SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that: (1) The transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; * * * is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan to Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a).

Now, Mr. Loos, the Solicitor, testified that, in his opinion, section 7 of the Reorganization Act, which includes an officer under the term "agency," authorizes the transfer of all of these functions to the Secretary. However, if, for the sake of argument, we conclude that he is technically correct, do you believe it was the spirit and intent of these sections to authorize a transfer of all functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, without any further explanation as to what would happen to them? Is such a transfer a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and does plan No. 2 comply with the spirit and intent of that portion of section 3 which requires that the President make a declaration with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, where he has found that such reorganization is necessary? What reorganizations—note the plural—does he include in this plan? Does not the authority contained in section 3 (1), in dealing with transfers to the jurisdiction of another agency, mean an agency other than the Secretary; particularly in view of the fact that plan No. 2 transfers all of the functions of all of the agencies, officers, and employees to one point, namely, the Secretary of Agriculture?

If the Reorganization Act contemplated any such grant of authority to a nonelected official, why did it place a time limitation upon an elected official, the President? Do you believe a transfer of all of these functions to the Secretary is the kind of reorganization contemplated by the Reorganization Act? Does it not contemplate an outline in the plan of each transfer, and in the cases of the other findings, each consolidation, coordination, or abolition? Has the President made any finding of need for the authority he proposes to grant to the Secretary of Agriculture by plan No. 2? Has he included any form of reorganization?

Now looking at the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act, let us go to section 4, which uses such expressions as "any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3 shall change the name of any agency, the title of its head, and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head," and so forth. Four subparagraphs deal with things the President shall do. The proponents of the plan claim a technical compliance. Assuming that to be true, does that phraseology contemplate any such provisions as shown in plan No. 2?

Under what agency, other than the Secretary, if you call him an agency, is any function placed by this plan?

Dealing further with the spirit and intent of the act, the laugh comes when we go to section 11, which reads as follows:

Each reorganization plan which shall take effect shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public law, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

Now, does anyone seriously believe it was the intent and spirit of the Reorganization Act for any such thing as plan No. 2 to be printed in the Statutes at Large? Well, if this plan becomes effective, that is what will happen. And I assume that a layman or a lawyer, searching for the President's reorganization of the Department of Agriculture is expected to look into the Statutes at Large, or the Federal Register, read this plan, understand it, and know what it does and with whom and where functions of the Department reside.

If Mr. J. Earl Coke, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, does not know what the plan does, how can any layman or lawyer be expected to know.

I give you an excerpt from an article dated April 23 by Mr. E. W. Keickhefer,

farm editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal, reporting on an interview of J. Earl Coke, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, by members of the Newspaper Farm Editors Association:

When a report pointed out that the President's advisers, the Secretary's advisory committee, and members of the USDA staff had reviewed the reorganization proposal and asked, "with all due respect, do you mean to say that if the proposal passes Congress nobody here knows what will happen?" Coke replied, "I suspect you are right."

The proponents of this plan contend that it is identical with other plans that have become effective. While I have not had an opportunity to study all of the other reorganization plans which have become effective, I do not concede that they are identical with this one. I am told by Members who have been here for a long time that all of the other plans dealing with major departments have been accompanied by a blueprint or proposal of what was to be done under the plan. Definitely this was true in the case of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, plan No. 1 of 1951, and plan No. 14 of 1950 relating to labor standards and enforcements, which were specific. Should we assume, however, that the authority granted in other plans is identical to the authority herein granted, let us not overlook the fact that this plan deals with an agency next in importance to the Department of Defense—in many ways far more important. The Department of Agriculture interlocks its activities with those of States and counties and special districts and special areas of different types, created on the local and State level, to handle matters pertaining to agriculture. For example, can anyone contend that the functions of the Department of Commerce require the same kind of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States and local communities and people that is required in the Department of Agriculture in the maintenance of experiment station service, in the field of agriculture extension service, where the Federal Government, States, and counties cooperate financially and otherwise; is there anything in the Department of Commerce comparable to the activities in the PMA field where selected State officials serve on a State basis and local officials serve on a county level and even on the community level, officials selected by the farmers themselves? What about the field of REA associations and soil-conservation work and the many other activities of the Department of Agriculture which have a direct relationship with State and local governments and with the citizens themselves? Someone said the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare works down through the State and local levels. That is true in a sense with an entirely different purpose, but because it does, President Eisenhower said in Reorganization Plan No. 1 that none of the present functions should be taken from any officer in the reorganization of that Department. Plan No. 2 does not protect those functions created by Congress.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our present Secretary of Agriculture is asking for authority without telling us how he proposes to use it and without convincing us that he needs it to accomplish the purposes set forth in the President's letter accompanying the plan. Does any Member of this House presently know how much authority the Secretary of Agriculture now has? On page 106 of the hearings before our committee, you will find a record of my question and Mr. Benson's answer with respect to his present authority. I asked him if he had ever stated that the Secretary of Agriculture now had too much authority. Here is his answer:

Of course, I don't remember exactly what I have said on every occasion, but I do remember distinctly that I said I was very much surprised to find the great responsibility and authority vested in one office, namely, the Secretary of Agriculture. It's enough to almost stagger any person as he becomes familiar with the authority that has been centered in that office; and certainly were it not necessary in order to carry out the responsibility which is mine I would not be inclined to ask for any more authority.

When Mr. Benson appeared before the special subcommittee of the House to investigate the dairy industry in the United States he said:

The Secretary of Agriculture has a lot of authority now, as you know, Mr. Chairman. I am not seeking for myself more power or authority.

Then the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] made this statement:

I notice in a recent statement that you said the Secretary of Agriculture had too much authority.

To which Mr. Benson replied:

I have been very much surprised to find out how much authority is vested in the one office.

The statements are recorded in the hearings of the House committee in March and April 1953 on page 291. And then on pages 864 and 865, part 3 of the hearings wherein Mr. Benson appeared before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture we find the following:

Mr. ANDERSEN. I, personally, would like to know what your intent is for the future before I would be willing, as a Member of Congress, to vote to give you this authority. I think I am justified in asking of you what your intent is if we do give that authority to you. Also, do you have any specific plans in mind which will consolidate the Soil Conservation Service, the PMA, and the Extension Service?

Secretary BENSON. No. I can say to your last question, Mr. Chairman, that I do not have in mind any plans which will consolidate any agencies at the present time. We have not pursued our studies far enough to reach any conclusions on that. My feeling is that those agencies will continue probably as independent agencies. I feel that the Soil Conservation Service must continue. It is a very important one; the Extension Service is also.

Then on page 863 of the same record of hearings the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] asked this question of Mr. Benson:

How will this reorganization simplify and make more effective the operation of the Department?

Secretary Benson replied:

I do not know that I have reached a final conclusion, Mr. Chairman. It is a very big problem, of course.

Most assuredly I do not criticize the Secretary of Agriculture for not knowing how he proposes to use the authority contained in plan No. 2. I do, however, seriously question the wisdom of granting such authority until he knows how he wants to use it. Under the Reorganization Act he has until April 1, 1955, to submit any number of plans for reorganizations within the Department of Agriculture for consideration by Congress. It is interesting to note, nevertheless, that while there seem to be no plans as to how the Department will be reorganized, reorganization started immediately after the present Secretary took office. The Secretary moved into office on January 20 and I believe that around the 22d of January he proposed a reorganization plan under the powers he now has. On page 867, part 3, of the hearings of the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations on March 26 of this year, Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, was questioning Mr. John H. Davis, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and one of those in line to become an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN made the following inquiry:

I do not presume you have anything in mind which will take away from the township and county committees elected by the farmers any of their present authority?

Mr. DAVIS. That is right. We have not made any change in that at all.

Mr. ANDERSEN. You say you have made no changes. Have you any change in mind for the future?

Mr. DAVIS. No.

In spite of those statements just a little later the same morning Congressman FRED MARSHALL placed in the RECORD Notice General–101, which had been previously issued to State PMA committees without public announcements. It frankly stated that it will require realinement of duties and responsibilities in the Production and Marketing Administration. This matter is also referred to on pages 48, 49, and 50 of the hearings before the Senate subcommittee on Senate Resolution 100—disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953.

Note that I have said nothing about the plan's provision for additional Presidential appointees. The House Committee on Agriculture has previously found that the two additional Secretaries and the Administrative Assistant are needed. At the same time, it is an unusual thing that practically all of the reorganization proposals, allegedly designed to bring about more economy and greater efficiency, have actually resulted in the addition of employees. In view of campaign oratory during the recent general election, I was amazed when the first piece of legislation of any consequence upon which I was called to vote was to add another Under Secretary of State at a salary of $17,500. In view of the previous study which has been made of the needs for these additional Secretaries, nevertheless, and the recommendation of the appropriate committee, I, for one, would be willing to vote to give to the Department of Agriculture the additional officers requested.

Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, many of the leading

farm organizations are going along, so to speak, with this plan but the masses of the farmers of America are greatly concerned about the future. In view of statements which have been made by those in authority they have great reason for fear, and fear is a dangerous thing. They are already concerned about their boys on the battlefield of Korea, and now they have been repeatedly given reason to become concerned about their means of existence. I, frankly, feel that the day is fast approaching when the Secretary of Agriculture should tell the American farmers about the farm plan he has in mind. One of the serious objections to Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950 was that our farm policy had not been blueprinted. Do we now have any definite information about our future farm policy?

Mr. Speaker, I hope our present Secretary does an excellent job. If you give him this authority, he may do an excellent job. He may not abuse his authority. But most assuredly he is only one of the many Secretaries of Agriculture we may have in the years to come. If this plan becomes law, the destiny of the American farmer, insofar as his life is affected by functions of Government created by Congress, will be placed in the hands of whatever individual happens to be the head of the Department of Agriculture. Is it reasonable for us, under these circumstances, when the Secretary says he does not know what he will do with the power, to delegate this power and abdicate our responsibility?

All during the last general election there were voices that echoed and reechoed up and down and across our Nation singing battle tunes to recapture for the American people powers concentrated in the hands of a few. Does this plan recapture any authority for the American people? History has recorded the sad story of overcentralization and reluctance or inability on the part of legislative bodies to keep checks on the tremendous authority they grant to governments and to individuals. Our forefathers were wise indeed when they provided for our system of checks and balances. That system has played a great part in preserving for our people the freedom which we have and toward which our ancestors struggled for centuries. We have the power which was once in the hands of kings and dynasties. The experience of other nations should warn us that the freedom we have and the freedom we want to keep—which is security and opportunity, and a more abundant and meaningful way of life for all our people—is not to be preserved by giving up our power and responsibility to men of many promises or by isolating our Nation from the rest of the world. It is childish for us to place any blame for our misfortunes on the ideal of democracy. The trouble lies in ourselves. We have not yet fully accepted the responsibility, which is to be enlightened in our use of power. We are still fighting for the ideals of 1776.

Approximately 177 years ago the Declaration of Independence was enunciated by a struggling band of our forefathers. With a ragged Army of untrained farmers and craftsmen, facing the disciplined troops of the King of England, and the threat of mercenary Hessian soldiers, with only hope and courage in their hearts, the leaders of the American Revolution made one of the boldest declarations in history.

The phrases of that Declaration attracted the sympathy and the hopes of common people throughout the world:

> That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure those rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it.

That was more than a revolt against a particular tyranny. It was a revolt against despotism itself in whatever form it had expressed itself in the past or might reveal itself in the future. That Declaration embodied the ideal for an endless and worldwide struggle for human freedom. Today, however, democracy stands once again in a great shadow. In the midst of the chaos and complexities of this machine and atomic era, the people of many lands have forfeited the privileges of democracy for the paternalism of dictatorship.

Strong, and oftentimes sincere and honest, men, to begin with, have extended gloved hands filled with promised prosperity to discouraged and fearful people. Unwilling or afraid to decide their own destinies and still more fearful of the chaos of indecision, great peoples have delivered themselves and their children into those gloved hands, "only to discover themselves in the power of the mailed fist of dictators unable to give them bread, and forced to use the sword to compel the masses to be satisfied with stones."

It is fitting for us to pause and consider the suffering of those people who have given up their liberty and freedom and their power through their duly elected representatives, because they were unwilling to pay the price of freedom by accepting the responsibility of power. Many of them have neither security nor the liberty to struggle for it.

To the Congress of the United States, therefore, falls the historic mission of making democracy work by preserving and keeping for the people the powers which they won at such a costly price. I look upon the Congress of the United States as the peoples' principal safeguard of their freedom. Ours ought to be the breathtaking human adventure of actually promoting justice, creating domestic tranquility, providing for the common good, and attaining the general welfare and blessings of liberty.

Millions of Americans are awakening to a realization that for the first time in the history of America our land can be invaded, our cities can be bombed, and our Nation can become a bloody battlefield. Your democracy and my democracy is getting away from you and from me in direct ratio to the decline of Christianity and to the willingness of the people, through their duly elected representatives, to transmit to others their responsibilities. Sad will be the day, if ever it comes, when the Congress of the United States fails to breathe and to live the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Someone has said:

> Our Constitution stands as a rule and as a guide for rulers and people in peace as in war, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men at all times and under all circumstances. We in America today hold in our hands the fate of the world and the hope of the coming years. Disgrace and shame will be upon us if the light of freedom, shining so brightly in our eyes, be dimmed and if we trail in the dust the golden hopes of men.

This may sound foreign to the legislation at hand but truly it is not. Too much power in the hands of anyone who is not answerable directly to the people is the open door to chaos and destruction.

As we think upon this and similar legislation which may confront us from time to time, it is both fitting and appropriate for us to breathe and live the words of Abraham Lincoln uttered upon the Gettysburg battlefield on November 19, 1863. They contained not alone the spirit and challenge of that day, but the spirit and challenge of today and tomorrow:

> That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

The approval of this plan may not bring disaster, but it is another step in that direction.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, a member of the committee, complains rather bitterly that the committee did not take any action on his resolution. The committee did not take any action except to hold hearings. There are 171 pages of testimony printed and available to every Member of the House. The Secretary, Mr. Benson, Mr. Cooley, Mr. Hope, and others testified and were questioned by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and by others. The gentleman is a member of the committee, and if he wanted action all he had to do was to make a motion that the committee report out his resolution or take other action. He did neither. I do not criticize. Apparently he did not want any action because he did not make any motion nor did he ask for committee action. If he had, it would have been entertained and of course, acted upon.

Now the gentleman complains that Reorganization Plan No. 2 does not tell us what the Secretary of Agriculture intends to do. That is right. It is not a blueprint of proposed procedure. Like all other reorganization plans that ever came before this House, it proposes to bring about efficiency and economy—those two broad general catchwords. We were never able to learn when our good friends were in authority what any of the reorganization plans sent up would do. We have never been able to learn what they thought they were going to do. It is a little late to come in now, after you have supported the Reorganization Act, which enables this situation to arise, and cry about it. A little

late, a little late. I have always consistently opposed the basic reorganization which makes this situation possible. One reason was that under it the Congress was forced to take a declaration of good intentions rather than an outline which would give it some information as to the manner and means by which we were to get remedial legislation. If I wanted to be critical I would say to my young friend, "Where were you when we passed the Reorganization Act this year? Where were you?" As I recall, every Member of the House who voted on the Reorganization Act, except 3 Republicans and 2 from the other side, voted to adopt it. I opposed it, as I have always opposed it, because primarily it just discharges the Congress from doing its duty and turns our legislative function over to the executive department. I recall when there were 168 Republicans and every one of them who voted on the proposition but one, Bob Rich, of Pennsylvania, our former distinguished colleague, a man we all admire and respect, voted against the Reorganization Act.

On October 4, 1945, when an amendment to fix the effective date of a plan, in the following words, "But only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period, there has not been passed by either House a resolution stating in substance that it does not favor the reorganization plan," was before the House, of the 190 Republican Members, 24 were absent; 1, Rich, of Pennsylvania, opposed the amendment. But the others—163 in number—including the Republican leader, Mr. Martin, of Massachusetts; the assistant leader, Mr. Halleck, of Indiana; the party whip, Mr. Arends, of Illinois; and, believe it or not, Sherman Adams, then a Member of the House, later President Eisenhower's preconvention adviser and manager, now his executive assistant in the White House, voted for the amendment.

But when we got a Republican President, after 20 long years of suffering, what did we do? Republicans voted to give the President authority to send up these reorganization plans, and now we are in a mess, as the gentleman so clearly and forcefully pointed out. Up come these plans. No one in the House knows what the executive department intends to do. The Republicans vote for them because they have confidence in the integrity and the ability of the folks downtown.

Before, they voted against them because they did not have full confidence in some of the administrators who were to administer them. For instance, in Oscar Ewing. We did not like Oscar because of his ideas, we did not want any truck with him. We did not want him to have any truck with the writing of the legislation. But, along comes Mrs. Hobby from Texas, and, lo and behold, we took a plan which she was to administer. I voted "present" on that one. I did not want to vote against her. And the plan was endorsed by some who had previously opposed it. I could not vote for her as much as I admire her, nor for the plan. I could not do that, and so I just voted "present," I think for the first time since I came here.

So we have this reorganization bill. Always, heretofore, until we had a President we thought we had confidence in; maybe I should not say that; I will revise it and fix it up somewhat; we always voted against it, and now we vote for it; and these gentlemen over there, who were all in favor of reorganization plans when they had two Presidents before this one, they are all against this type of legislation now, while before they were for it. I do not know why the change, but it is all right with me. I like to accept those things.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana for a helpful suggestion and no criticism of my present position.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say at this point that I consider the original reorganization plan, that is, the basic authority——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What?

Mr. HALLECK. There were certain things about it that I was not too happy about, but I supported it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Pardon me. Let me make a correction. You were 1 of those 163 who, with the exception of our former colleague, Bob Rich, who voted for reorganization legislation, voted against the reorganization plan. That is the record.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit me, there were certain features, as I said, that I did not like, but in respect to the plans as they came along, there were many of them I did support. I would not want the record to stand to the effect that all of us on the Republican side opposed all of the reorganization plans which were sent up here because that just is not the way it was.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is not what I said. I was not talking about the plans but about the act which permitted them to be sent up. What I am talking about is the basic reorganization act. As long as the issue has been raised, I will print, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD, and I will print the names. No, I will just refer to the RECORD, October 4, 1945, where they are found.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman said a while ago that all of us on this side now are against it. I think that is covering a little bit too much territory. I know I am not against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, I have often been accused, and probably have been guilty as I now may be of covering too much territory and perhaps unsuccessfully. If the gentleman says he voted against the act which permits plans to be submitted I stand corrected.

With these disapproving resolutions, do you see where we get?

Up comes a plan. I do not know how many we have now. There are four, I believe, over there on my desk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Five.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts who has a minimum of admiration for me, as he said one day, corrects me and says there are five. I thank the gentleman for that compliment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield, but I wonder what you are going to say.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want the RECORD clear that I said not a minimum of admiration——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, a minimum of admiration. I looked it up and it means that is the least possible admiration. On the other hand, I have the greatest possible admiration, a maximum of admiration for the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the RECORD to show that I said a minimum of high regard.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Ho, hum. The purpose was the same.

Under permission to revise my remarks, I will give you just what did happen on the 30th day of March, 1953, when, after the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] had characterized my appointment of a special subcommittee as "a disgraceful abuse of power," he continued:

> Why, if anyone said to me on the floor of the House or outside of this House that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was disgraceful, I would resent it and I would defend him, and I would defend the gentleman because I have a minimum high regard for him.

When I thanked him for the compliment by stating:

> I just call attention of the House, after words expressing some sort of appreciation of the gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman then said it was a minimum.

He continued:

> Mr. McCORMACK. No, no, I said "minimum high regard" and very few have even that for my friend. I am still one of the few Members of the House that have a liking for him.
>
> Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for that compliment. There may be more than you think.
>
> Mr. McCORMACK. I hope there are, because I am a kindhearted fellow. I want to think well and good of all of my fellow men, and I want all of my fellow men to think well of others, and to think there are more than a few that have a minimum high regard for my dear friend.
>
> Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. Let me call attention to this, as strange as it may seem to you.
>
> Mr. McCORMACK. Strange as it may seem? You are one of my strange things.
>
> Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And difficult as it may be for you to give credence to it, I never made any statement to the press. I never saw those papers until you waved one of them over in the committee hearing. I have not read one of them—but will do so at my earliest convenience.
>
> Mr. McCORMACK. The fact remains that somebody spoke to the press. I did not. That is a fact. Somebody did the speaking.

The gentleman then on that occasion proceeded to criticize me because he had not received notice of subcommittee meetings. As a matter of fact, there had been no such subcommittee meetings.

And if after that "compliment," wholly undeserved, you could have seen

me the next time I went to buy a hat, after I read his remarks in the RECORD, it was two sizes smaller than the one previously worn. And the old hat? If it had not been for my ears it would have gone clear down over my head. That is the effect the gentleman's "compliment" had on me. Thankful am I that my constituents have not accepted his opinion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, back to the issue here before us. Other plans are coming up. There are 5 or 8 on my desk. In order that the nearings can be held, and to save the time of those in the executive departments, and to save the time of the members of the committee, so that we may hold hearings and get it over with and report back to the House, it is my purpose, if no one else does, in 3 or 4 days, if not today, to introduce a disapproving resolution without even knowing what the plan would do, if it were adopted. That will let the House have a chance to discuss the plan.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Why is not the gentleman willing to discharge the committee, and give this House an opportunity to discuss the proposed plan. That is what my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] is asking for.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Because you have been so slow on it, and the plan will go into effect anyway. You do not have the votes to disapprove it, so what is the use of wasting time.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] waited until the last day of the 60-day period before he made the motion to discharge the committee, in the hope that the gentleman would call his committee together and take action, and then the House could know and understand and discuss this question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman did not ask for such action. I did not believe it would bring any different result if we voted his resolution up or down. I think the vote we take today will prove I was right. My colleague who has just made that statement was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture last year, was he not? It was his privilege to introduce a resolution, if you wanted to, and you fooled along with it. You know, do you not, that you do not have the votes to reject the plan, that the motion to discharge will be defeated? Everybody here on the Republican side, with a few exceptions, will vote against the motion to discharge the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that the Senate in 1950 rejected an almost similar plan.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I think possibly this procedure is legal, but it is certainly highhanded and very unusual. In the last few years, there have been 18 or 19 reorganization plans brought to this Congress. In not a single instance has the House been denied the privilege of discussing the merits or demerits of the various plans. Why should we be denied that privilege in this instance? It makes us all rather suspicious. Is there something to be concealed? Is there something in this plan that the proponents wish to hide? Why all of this extraordinary effort to cover up? Why should we not have the privilege of discussing this matter?

I do not know whether the gentleman from North Carolina, the author of the disapproving resolution, acted exactly at the appropriate time or not. The chairman of the committee indicates that he did not. But the fact remains that he proceeded and acted within the rules as laid down under the Reorganization Act and he is not to be criticized for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point was that he might have acted before.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well then, he did act within the proper time and what he has done is not improper. Therefore, I do not think he should be criticized for what he has done and that is the only interpretation to be placed on the gentleman's remarks.

This plan was sent up on March 25. It was said that the reason for it was to effect efficiency and economy and eliminate overlapping authority in the Department of Agriculture. I do not know of a man or woman in this House who would disapprove of such. But that is rather general reasoning. How will it accomplish these things? I do not know whether that is what the plan will do or not. If it will, I am all for it—strong. Secretary Benson says he does not know what he will do. Then, how do we know that what he may hereafter do would be good. I want to know what his plans are and I am entitled to that information.

I would like to hear those who are for the plan explain in detail what it will do for agriculture and I would like to hear those who disapprove of it give their views as to what it will not do to agriculture.

May I impress upon you that in the last few years, of the 18 or 19 plans which have been submitted to this Congress, in not a single, solitary instance has this committee denied the House the privilege and opportunity of debating, and voting on each plan. Why this unusual highhanded method of forcing this thing down our throats?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. We are now assured by the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the committee [Mr. HOFFMAN] that we will not hereafter be denied the right to discuss all other reorganization plans, because the chairman has said that he would introduce the disagreeing resolution, if it became necessary for him to do so. That, to me, is a very good reason for us to discharge this committee and fix a reasonable time for debate, so that we can discuss this reorganization plan for agriculture.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is a very unfair position to take, to throw over onto the chairman of the committee the things that you should do for yourselves. I cannot wet-nurse everybody who wants to oppose any of these plans.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I do not yield further, Mr. Speaker.

I think the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] has done all he could do as a member of the Government Operations Committee to permit the 435 Members of this House to discuss a plan which affects a very vital agency of this Government. And I wish to compliment him for his effort.

There are approximately 30 million people who live on our farms. The Department of Agriculture is probably closer to more people than any other agency of this Government. And here we have pending a proposal to reorganize that Department, giving unto the Secretary unlimited powers to do with it almost as he will. Yet we are denied even the privilege of discussing the plan, of inquiring who is for it and why. Such is a poor example of democracy in action. No matter how good the plan may be the people will condemn you for putting it into effect in such a manner.

The distinguished chairman of this committee—and he is a very able and entertaining man—justified the language of the plan on the ground that the Democrats had invoked similar plans. Well, look where we Democrats are now. Maybe that is one of the reasons we lost control of this Government. Do you not remember last year when you Republicans were carrying your appeal to the people of this country, criticizing the Democrats for delegating great and unlimited powers to the Chief Executive and to the heads of his departments? Do you not remember how you told the people you were going to see to it that the Congress recaptured its power? Where would you be today if you had told the people last fall you were going to do as the Democrats had done?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I yield the gentleman another one-half minute.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You told the people you were going to see to it that the Congress recaptured its powers and again become the real representatives and voice of the people, and the maker of their laws. You successfully criticized the Democrats for yielding to the executive department and now you find yourselves doing the same thing without even a chirp.

I do not think it is a very good argument to say, "The reason we Republicans are doing it this way is because that is the way you Democrats did it." Remember that you came into power criticizing the way we had heretofore conducted ourselves.

If you are not afraid of this plan, if you are able to defend it, then let us have a full, free, and complete discussion of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who will discuss the issues.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take time to discuss the theory of the Reorganization Act or the policies which should or should not be followed in the committee. Rather, I shall devote what little time I have to discussing just what is contemplated in this reorganization proposal.

Let me say, in the first place, that plan No. 2 is nothing new, as far as reorganization plans go. Except for a few safeguards, it is identical with the plans approved by the Congress in the 81st and 82d Congresses for the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, the Post Office Department, the Interior Department, the Labor Department, and the Department of Commerce.

What the plan does can be stated very briefly: With the exception of certain agencies that are excepted, it transfers to the Secretary all functions not now vested in him of all other officers, agencies, and employees of the Department of Agriculture.

It creates three new positions: Two Assistant Secretaries, and an administrative assistant to the Secretary. I believe everyone will agree that those places are needed. The Department of Agriculture today has but 1 Assistant Secretary, while every other department has from 3 to 10.

Then it authorizes the Secretary to delegate the functions that have been vested in him to any officers, agency, or employee of the Department subject to giving public notice with oportunity for interested parties to be heard.

It authorizes the transfer within the Department of records, property, and personnel as well as unexpended balances of appropriations with the proviso that the funds transferred may be used only for the purposes for which the appropriations were originally made.

The important thing to remember about this plan, and the important thing about all the other plans that I have mentioned, is that it does not permit the Secretary to change functions. He can transfer a function from one agency to another, but he cannot change a function; he cannot abolish a function, and he cannot create a function; only Congress can do those things. The only thing that he can do is to move the functions from one agency in the Department to another in the interest of better and more efficient administration.

As I said a moment ago, this plan is exactly the same plan this Congress has approved for six other Cabinet departments; and, certainly, if it is wrong to give the Secretary of Agriculture this power, then we should take away from these other department heads the power that has been given them to make their departments operate more efficiently and economically.

Let me call your attention to what in practical effect we are giving the Secretary under this reorganization plan: I will begin by listing the agencies which are excepted. They are: first, the corporations, like the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Crop Insurance Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation, of course, is one of the most important agencies in the Department, because it deals with the price support programs. The crop insurance program is also important. The plan exempts these corporations. It exempts the advisory board of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It exempts the Farm Credit Administration or any agency, officer, or entity under or subject to the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration.

The following agencies in the Department are not affected by the plan because the Secretary already has control of all of their functions. I want to enumerate them as follows: Agriculture Research Administration, which was set up by Claude Wickard back in 1942 as a reorganization plan within the Department; the Production and Marketing Administration set up by Clinton Anderson in a reorganization of the Department while he was Secretary.

The Commodity Exchange Authority, the Extension Service, the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, recently reorganized by the present Secretary; there is the Office of Budget and Finance, the Office of Information, Office of Personnel, Office of Plant and Operations and the Library. None of those agencies can be affected in any way by this plan because the Secretary already has the authority to deal with them and most of them have been changed, modified, and reorganized throughout the years without arousing any more than passing comment and attention.

That leaves only the following agencies which are affected: The Bureau of Agricultural Economics. That Bureau does not determine departmental policy, everybody knows that. There is the Forest Service, a very noncontroversial agency, the Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration and the Office of the Solicitor, which, of course, is a legal, not a policymaking office.

Some Members in discussing this matter in the lobbies and cloakrooms have expressed the fear that the Secretary might effect a reorganization under this plan which would affect price-support programs. Well, the answer to that suggestion is that this plan does not permit the Secretary to deal with functions in any way except to transfer them from one agency to another so there is nothing here which would affect that matter one way or another. In the second place, the Production and Marketing Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation are the two agencies which deal with price supports. The Secretary already has the power to do anything he sees fit to do with PMA. As to the Commodity Credit Corporation it is excepted from this reorganization plan, hence nothing could be done with its activities even if that were desired.

There are three agencies affected by this plan in which there is great public interest. One is the Soil Conservation Service, another is the Farmers' Home Administration and the other is the Rural Electrification Administration. I know there are Members of Congress who have been sincerely concerned because they thought some substantial changes might be made in those agencies. Of course, the only thing that could be done would be to transfer their functions or to consolidate their functions with those of some other agency in the Department.

I think all of us are entitled to know what the attitude of the present Secretary of Agriculture is toward those agencies and what ideas he might have concerning them. When he was before the Committee on Government Reorganization he was asked a number of questions on these matters to which he replied very sincerely and frankly.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary was asked the question whether he would consolidate the Farmers' Home Administration with the Farm Credit Administration which, of course, he cannot do. He could not do it even if he wanted to, because the Farm Credit Administration is not involved here. It is exempted. In answer to a question by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] he said:

> Secretary BENSON. Let me mention the Farmers' Home Administration first. The question has been raised several times. It was raised before the Senate committee. Farm Credit Administration and Farmers' Home Administration are two distinct agencies. One of them deals in what we call hard or sound credit and the other in soft or emergency type credit. I am on record before the Senate committee, and I would like to repeat my position here, that I have no intention whatever of dismantling the Farmers' Home Administration. I feel that the Farm Credit Administration and the Farmers' Home Administration operate in different fields and that they are both needed. The Farm Credit Administration is intended to extend solid credit, while the Farmers' Home Administration serves those who are not able to get credit from the usual credit agencies. I would question very much the wisdom of trying to consolidate those two agencies.

I know there are some Members who are concerned about the Soil Conservation Service. There have been rumors at various times that the Soil Conservation Service might be consolidated with the Extension Service or that other action agences might be consolidated with the Extension Service. So I asked the Secretary when he was before the committee this question:

> What is your general feeling on the question of whether action agencies, like the Soil Conservation Service, should be consolidated or merged with the educational agencies like the Extension Service?

Here is his reply:

> Secretary BENSON. Well, Congressman HOPE, I've always looked upon the Extension Service as being primarily an educational agency, and Soil Conservation and PMA are action agencies. It has always seemed to me that these action agencies and educational agencies have a different function and, therefore, the work ought to be done in separate organizations, separate agencies.

There have been questions raised about the REA. On that point I want to read what the Secretary has said in a letter to me in which he quotes from statements he has made before the House and Senate committees. In that letter

he refers to a question asked him by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN]:

Do you intend to transfer the REA to the Farmers' Credit Administration?

Secretary Benson said:

No, I have no plans of that sort whatever.

Then the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] said:

One other question I will ask you. These matters concern a lot of people. Do you intend to change the name of the REA to the RES?

Secretary BENSON. I don't know what the S stands for.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Rural Electrification Service.

Secretary BENSON. I have never heard of it.

Speaking further of the Rural Electrification Administration, the Secretary quoted from his testimony before the committee as follows:

On the question of the Rural Electrification Administration, I am very much interested in that program, although some people have accused me of being otherwise. My boyhood goes back to the time where we did not have the telephone and the electric light. I will never forget the day we had the electric light in our home. * * * I have been tremendously interested in the Rural Electrification Administration program and seeing it extended in other areas of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has been reading the testimony from the hearings, has he not, before that?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure.

Mr. HOPE. To conclude, I think the purposes and the ideas of Secretary Benson are very well summed up in this letter in which he says, "The entire purpose of the plan is to enable the Department to more effectively, efficiently, and economically carry out the will of Congress as expressed in substantive legislation."

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture ought to have the same right and authority to put his house in order that six other Secretaries in the Government departments already have. He ought to have the opportunity to reorganize the Department of Agriculture so that it can render a better service to the farmers of this country. Why should the agency which deals with agriculture be less efficient and less effective than the agencies that are set up to look after other matters of Government interest and concern. Mr. Speaker, this motion to discharge the committee should be voted down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The speech of the gentleman from Kansas was fine, but it just shows what we have before us. Some of the rest of us would like to have a little time to discuss the demerits of the plan.

Mr. POAGE. The whole purpose of our plea today is that the House should give us time to discuss a program that is of vital importance to the American people and particularly to the farmers. The resolution that you are voting on is not a resolution either approving or rejecting the reorganization plan; the resolution is one to discharge the committee in order that the House of Representatives may debate and pass upon the plan.

It is my hope that we may be able to consider the merits or demerits of this proposal without regard to the personality of the present Secretary of Agriculture, or of any past or future Secretaries. I have every confidence in the personal character and integrity of Secretary Benson. I have had the opportunity to meet him on several occasions. He has impressed me as a man of high ideals and noble purposes. I am sure that he is dedicated to what he conceives to be the welfare of American farmers. I do not wholly agree with him as to the methods, or lack of methods he desires to use. I fear that the fact that lots of people question the effectiveness of his plans has at least contributed to the present widespread lack of confidence in the livestock and commodities markets. I do not believe, and most people do not believe, that you can make farmers prosperous by reducing their income. I do not, however, doubt that the Secretary sincerely believes that he is following a sound course.

Fortunately, it is not necessary for us to agree on the question of price supports, and on the desirable level of farm prices, to resolve the question now before us. Simply stated, that question is, "Do we believe it is desirable to delegate the power of the legislative branch to the Executive, without any clear statement, without even any outline, of the way in which those powers will be used?" I consider such a blind delegation of power to be an unwise policy. I am always fearful of any concentration of power. I have not, however, been unmindful of the fact that as a practical matter it is necessary to give the Executive power to reorganize the activities of the various departments. I have, therefore, as most of you have, voted to give the power to initiate such reorganizations to the President. I voted to give that power to a Democratic President. I voted to give the same power to the present Republican President. But, the legislation we passed clearly provided that any reorganization plan should be submitted to the Congress with an explanation of the reasons for the reorganization. The legislation also provided that the President should give each of the two Houses of Congress a chance to reject any proposed plan.

Three years ago the other House of this Congress rejected a plan for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture very similar to this proposal. I know that it is possible to split hairs and to allege that this proposal is not absolutely identical with the 1950 proposal, but I challenge any Member to point out any really substantial difference. I hope that the advocates of this plan will be fair and not hide behind some meaningless technicality. In fact, this so-called "plan" does nothing specific except to give the Secretary three additional Assistant Secretaries. I voted to give him these Assistant Secretaries in the past. I stand ready to give them to him now.

Now the gentleman who just preceded me—my esteemed and beloved chairman—pointed out what Mr. Benson, the present Secretary of Agriculture, would not do, and I am sure that he will not do the things that he said he will not do, but he has not said what he is going to do. Now, I ask you as reasonable men and women why should the head of any Department come and ask the Congress for unlimited and unspecified power if he does not have anything in mind in regard to the use of those powers? There has not been one suggestion, and I challenge the gentleman who is going to follow on the Republican side, to name one thing that the Secretary of Agriculture should do, and which he will be able to do under this plan, that he does not have the power to do now?

Oh, you can say that this plan will give him three Assistant Secretaries, and so it will, but that is not a part of the reorganization; that is legislation. I supported that legislation 3 years ago for the then Secretary and I will support it now for the present Secretary.

We have been told some of the things that the present Secretary will not do if given this power. We have no idea what any future Secretary may or may not do. The Congress has been requested to simply delegate unlimited and unspecified powers, not simply to the present Secretary of Agriculture, but to all his successors. Actually, the picture which the administration has painted, or failed to paint, reminds me of the man who was found sitting on a hill overlooking a mental institution, painting with a dry brush on a perfectly blank canvas. He was asked, "What are you painting?" He replied, "This is a picture of the Children of Israel crossing the Red Sea." "Where are the Children of Israel?" he was asked. He replied, "They have passed on before." "Where is the Red Sea?" "It is rolled back," he explained. "Well, where is the Pharoah and his chariots?" "They will be along presently," the artist replied.

I suppose that artist's blank canvas truly and correctly represented exactly the conditions he purported to represent, but it conveyed very little to the onlooker. Possibly Reorganization Plan No. 2 meets the technical requirements of the Reorganization Act, but it is still a blank canvas, and it surely conveys no information to this House. I don't feel that this plan meets the intent of Congress. I think this House should be given a full and frank disclosure of the Secretary's positive as well as of his negative plans before, not after, this remarkable grant of power is effected. Up to this moment, we do not have such a disclosure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am for the plan, but I am for the orderly conduct of the business of the Congress as set out in the Reorganization Act in handling matters of reorganization.

The able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture stated that he would discuss the issues. He did not discuss the issue now before the Congress, because the issue before the Congress now is whether or not we are going to discharge the Committee on Government Operations and have this matter heard on the floor of the Congress. A resolution of disapproval was filed. The law provides that the Committee on Government Operations should hold hearings upon that resolution, and report back to the Congress in 10 days, and if they fail to report back, then any Member of the Congress has the right to call up that matter before this body and so availing himself of that right given to him under the law. Inasmuch as the Committee on Government Operations failed to report back to the House, the Congressman now stands before you, and asks for time for this plan to be considered. The very fact that the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture stood up here for 20 minutes and defended the plan is an argument why this Congress should hear every Member who is against that plan. I am appealing to the Members of this Congress to give to the Congress that right provided by the Reorganization Act under which this plan was drawn. When I was chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, then called the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, disapproving resolutions were filed, we held our hearings, and, in each case, reported back to the Congress and gave the Congress an opportunity to hear both sides of the matter when it had been raised under the Reorganization Act. I am appealing to you today to grant the motion of this Congressman to discharge this committee, of which I am a member, and let this matter be heard on the floor of the Congress.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to discharge this resolution from the committee. In the minute that is available to me, I merely want to point out to my friends on the other side of the aisle, as well as to my friends on my side of the aisle, that I have been greatly interested in governmental reorganization. I am for this plan, as my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, said he is. I do not think it is the best plan that we could have, but it is probably the best plan that we can get.

But all we are asking for here today is to be given an opportunity to discuss this plan on this floor.

I was chairman of the citizens committee which supported the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in my State. I went up and down my State with Republicans and Democrats at my side urging support of those recommendations. One of the questions most frequently asked me was, "Is this not a dangerous delegation of legislative responsibility to the Executive?"

I constantly said to my friends that the Congress would protect the people against that danger, and that the requirements in the parent reorganization law of congressional review and of congressional opportunity to reject were adequate safeguards against the danger.

If the House does what it seems it is about to do, I am afraid today I will have to go back home and say, "No, Congress will not protect the people against this danger." I want to see the Congress get back its legislative and constitutional responsibilities. I think my party went too far in the direction of delegation of these responsibilities. We ought to get back where we rightfully belong as a legislative body.

There has been no real opportunity for the Members of Congress to examine this reorganization plan. Our committee held a brief and entirely inadequate hearing. At no time has our committee ever discussed this plan; at no time has the plan ever been submitted to our committee for approval or disapproval; and unless an opportunity is afforded the membership on the floor today, this House will have permitted this important reorganization plan of one of the largest departments in the Government to go into operation without even the most superficial examination.

This seems to me to be the last step, not only in delegation of legislative responsibility, but in absolute neglect of legislative responsibility. The least that the people of this country can expect from us is that we will take time enough to make an examination of these proposals when they are submitted to us under the law.

The question before us is not approval or disapproval of the Agriculture Department's reorganization plan. The only question that confronts us at this hour is whether or not we will take the time, as we are required to do, to study a reorganization plan when it is submitted to us under the law of the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute and 30 seconds.

Now this is where we are at. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and the gentleman who just left the well, both said they were for this plan. Many others have made like statements. Now what do they want?

If they are for it, they certainly must know what is in it. Neither would be for something he did not know anything about. To argue otherwise would be to suggest incompetency—that none could do. Why then do they want to talk about the plan?

And if they do want to talk about it, why did they not come along with a resolution long before and get it on the floor where if they wished and the House agreed we could have had 10 hours' debate. They had that opportunity. Talk about hearings. Listen, here they are. There are 171 pages of testimony. Mr. COOLEY testified over 18 pages. Mr. HOPE testified; Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. DAWSON, and others questioned Secretary Benson. The committee did not consider that there was anything in the plan that would justify further consideration by the House and hence decided to let it become law at the end of the 60-day period.

If we vote against this motion to discharge the committee, the plan will become effective at midnight tonight. As long as gentlemen are for it, why waste the time of the House? Why do you not go along and vote against the motion to discharge the committee? If on any other plan debate is desired it can be had by the introduction of a resolution.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the submission of this Reorganization Plan No. 2, I have attempted by various means to ascertain just what the Secretary of Agriculture proposes to do under this plan. I have failed to learn. I had hoped under the orderly operation of the Reorganization Act that a proposal would be brought to the floor of this House, and that then I could sit and listen to such informed Members as the distinguished chairman of my Committee on Agriculture, and then perhaps since he would be expected to have the confidence of the Secretary, I might have some hope of learning just what was proposed in the plan. Frankly, I do not know whether I could conscientiously support the plan or not. I am inclined to think I could not, but I could be convinced and go along with your Secretary, if you would give me an opportunity on the floor of this House of listening to your reasons, whatever they may be, for supporting the plan. I want to support this motion to discharge. I listened to my chairman in his remarks, and about all I gathered from that was that we should, by unanimous consent, acquiesce in the adoption of this plan, on the ground that 5 or 6 other plans had been adopted. To me that is not a compelling reason.

The chairman of the Committee on Government Operations gives as his excuse for not following orderly procedure the fact that there are not enough votes in the House to defeat the plan. I would like to know how he knows how many votes there are for or against.

I grant you, Mr. Speaker, that there are probably many things that should be done within the Department of Agriculture in the way of reorganization. In fact, if I had the time, I could suggest some things that should be done on this score. However, before voting to give any appointive official of the Government unlimited authority to reorganize as he sees fit, I should like to be advised, at least in a general way, as to what he proposes to do.

It is true that the Secretary has said that he wants to reorganize in such way as to achieve more efficient and economical operation of the Department, but he does not say, even in a general way, as to how he propose to achieve this end. No Member of this House would be more pleased to know that efficiency and economy had been achieved in the operation of all departments of the Government and I sincerely hope that the Secretary of Agriculture is successful in achieving this worthy goal

when he is given the authority that he is obviously going to be given by this Plan No. 2.

If the plan has all the merit its proponents claim for it, then they should not object to the passage of this discharge resolution which does no more than give the Members of this House the opportunity of being advised as to just how good the plan is. By the same token, those who are opposed to the plan would have the opportunity of presenting their side of the case.

One of the greatest mistakes, in my opinion, that has been made by the Congress during the past 20 years, is that more and more legislative authority has been yielded to the executive department of this Government. This plan No. 2 seems to be another step in the direction of ultimately surrendering all legislative authority to the executive department. If this be true then I would be constrained to oppose the plan. On the other hand, if there are adequate safeguards protecting the legislative prerogatives of Congress, I would like for the proponents of the measure to have the opportunity of assuring the Congress and the American people accordingly in open debate on the floor of this House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to ask the gentleman a question.

Did you read the hearings, 171 pages of them?

Mr. WHEELER. I did.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You have read the hearings?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And you still do not know what is in the plan?

Mr. WHEELER. No, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the only plan here is to give not to Mr. Benson specifically but to the Secretary of Agriculture, the right to reorganize, to do just about what he pleases with the Department of Agriculture, with the exception of four agencies. Mr. Benson himself says he has no plan if you do give him this authority. From the actions of some people apparently they think they know what he will do. Let us say for argument's sake that you would approve what he might do with this authority. Mr. Benson might not be there a year. This is a continuing grant of authority. This is permanent legislation that you provide in this grant of power. Some may say they have confidence in the present administration and in the present Secretary, Mr. Benson, doing what is right. What if former Secretary Brannan comes back as Secretary of Agriculture? He had his views. If he did come back as Secretary certainly he would not do what many wanting this grant of authority want done. But if he should come back, this authority would be his. What then? His coming back is not impossible. Some folks even say the President may not be elected as many as four times. You are granting power to the Secretary of Agriculture, whoever he may be, to do almost as he pleases from now on with this department. Instead of you passing laws for the operation of the Department he does. Instead of you repealing laws he does. Also you are doing the act of divesting yourselves of authority and responsibility in this high-handed way of not even bringing the matter on the floor for discussion on its merits. You say you have the votes to put it over anyway. Perhaps you do but perhaps you would not have if we had time to really point out what is involved here. In my judgment it is basic. Is this the legislative branch or is it not? If you do not discharge this committee you will not have any chance to discuss on its merits what is involved here.

I make no attack on Secretary Benson. I opposed this same move when Mr. Brannan was Secretary of Agriculture. At that time Mr. Davis opposed it. Mr. Short opposed it. Now they are for it. Of course now, if this grant becomes law they will be Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, positions which I guess were not offered them before. Of course I would not say that is their reasoning but this authority if granted will be left for the next Secretary whoever he is. If this Congress is going to do this kind of thing, leave it to the executive department. Why not stay at home and merely send a message to the executive branch of the Federal Government and tell it to go ahead and run the whole business. I favor quite a bit of reorganization in the Department but let us do it by law after proper discussion. To effect changes in agricultural laws through the Congress may be too slow and cumbersome for some people—but is safer in the long run. That is my way. I hope you will pass the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is rather unfortunate that Members of the House will not have an opportunity to discuss the proposed reorganization plan for the Department of Agriculture. I regret very much that the Committee on Government Operations has apparently refused to take final action on the resolution introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman FOUNTAIN. According to my information, no other reorganization plan to which a disapproving resolution has been filed has been permitted to go into effect without adequate time for debate. We are today assured by the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan] that hereafter disapproving resolutions will be filed in connection with every other proposed reorganization plan, even if it is necessary for him to file such disapproving resolution. This means that hereafter, as heretofore, adequate time for debate will be provided. If this is the situation which has heretofore existed and which will hereafter obtain, it is strange indeed that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations should refuse to permit his own committee to work its will and opposes discharging the committee from further consideration, so that Members of the House might work their will on this monstrous plan. This proposed reorganization will be forced upon us without an opportunity to even discuss it here on the floor of the House. The hearings before the committee were not printed until I insisted that the chairman order the printing to be done. Can there be any real reason for the committee to refuse to take action on a matter of this importance? Refusing to discharge this committee and to permit adequate time for debate is, to say the least, inappropriate and unbecoming. This is obviously nothing but a grab for power. If you permit this reorganization plan to go into operation, you will be surrendering your legislative functions to the Secretary of Agriculture. You will turn over to Mr. Benson lock, stock, and barrel the entire Department of Agriculture and the future welfare of our farmers.

The Congress has arranged the Department of Agriculture as the Congress thought it should be arranged. Now we are about to give to the Secretary the right to rearrange the Department according to his own wishes and plans. I want to make one thing perfectly clear and that is that I am definitely and unalterably opposed to this grab for power and I am not willing to surrender to the Secretary of Agriculture my legislative functions. My distinguished colleague the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], made an effort to justify this insidious proposal and he tried laboriously to discover merit in the proposition now before us. He pointed out that the Secretary had told us that he would not do certain things, but never on one occasion has the Secretary told us one thing he intends to do.

Here is the plan in 16 words:

> There are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him.

That is the plan: All the functions of all the agencies of all the employees of all the people in Agriculture are placed in him, and then he shall do with it just as he pleases.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am one of many who, at the moment, is not completely sure how he is going to vote on this plan when it comes up on its merits. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture or Government Operations Committee, and I have not had a chance as an individual Member of Congress to take a good look at the plan—other than what is written into it, and what was in the President's message accompanying it. I think it is my duty as a Member of Congress to be as fully informed as possible on any measures that come before us in this Congress. Certainly it is the duty of

Congress to take a look at this measure; not to blindly pass judgment on it. I think that the attempt to railroad this legislation through the House without giving the House an opportunity to look at it is shameful.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman's observations.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to say that I certainly think the committee should be discharged. This is a matter of great importance. It should be discussed by the House, and I hope that the Members will give these Members who feel so strongly about this subject the right to discuss it in full before the House.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Now, back to the proposition before us. Will you stifle the debate or will you permit a full and frank discussion? Is the administration afraid to face the facts in forthright fashion? Does the administration actually have a plan? If so, is there any Member of this House who knows what it is? If the administration would comply with the clear provisions of the Reorganization Act and submit a real plan for our consideration, we might be ready and willing to approve it, but why should we take a leap into the dark unknown and blindly surrender our functions to the Secretary of Agriculture who frankly admits he does not know why he wants the power or what he will do with it if it is conferred upon him? It will be difficult for you to explain to your constituents why you gave away and surrendered your legislative authority and responsibility. Yes, Mr. Benson will take over at midnight and functions will start flying from one to another when the sun comes out of the east tomorrow. Oh, how happy Mr. Benson will be when he realizes in the morning that he is the lord and master of all he surveys. You Republicans came here on a promise to decentralize this great bureaucratic Government. You told the people that you would recapture and reclaim the powers and the authority which the Democrats had taken away from the people and you promised to transfer those powers back to the people, but what are you doing now? You are utterly disregarding your campaign pledges. You are centralizing power rather than decentralizing. You are placing all the power under the Department of Agriculture in the hands of one man to wield and to use it or to abuse it as he pleases. We do not have the votes to stop you but there will be another day.

While I do not know what intentions the great Secretary of Agriculture has, because he has flatly refused to tell us what he intends to do, I am very much afraid that he will wield the hatchet in ruthless fashion. He will in all probability fire people by the dozens without regard to the efficient manner in which they have served the public, and when he has made room enough for the faithful—and I mean by that not those who have been faithful to the Government but those who have been faithful to the Republican Party, he will then retransfer the functions to those who will be paid off with patronage. What becomes of civil service? It becomes a mockery, a sham, and a delusion. This administration seems to have one objective in mind—to cut expenditures without regard to national defense, domestic security, or ultimate consequences—to reduce personnel without regard to faithful service to the end that the faithful few might be rewarded.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to this debate. It has been very interesting to me as I have considerable agriculture in my district.

Our distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, has said this reorganization plan is an attempt to "grab for power." Well, you know this is pretty hard to take after the last administration was in power for 20 years—a bureaucratic administration with an insatiable appetite for power, reaching out for more and more power, over the years, over the lives and destines of the American people; ramming down our throats, year after year, anything and everything they wanted.

I think they are greatly concerned because there may be some changes, and certainly the Department of Agriculture needs some changes.

I am quite sure Secretary Benson will not come up with the program that former Secretary Wallace had during his administration when they converted the young hogs into fertilizer to distribute the fertilizer to the farmer to increase the yield and production, and plow it under. Or with the plan of the previous Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, who conceived the Brannan plan, high prices for the producer and low prices for the consumer but nobody ever mentioned who was going to pay the bill.

The present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, is talking about efficiency and economy, eliminating duplication and overlapping, and I have every confidence in him. Secretary Benson is the finest type of man we have in public life; a man of recognized ability, character, and integrity. I feel certain he will turn in a great performance if he is given a chance to reorganize the Department of Agriculture.

Certainly in 6 months you cannot correct the mistakes of the past 20 years.

We certainly ought to be reasonable and give him an opportunity to reorganize and do the kind of a job I know he can do if he is given this opportunity. He is a firm believer in the American way of life. He is interested in those things that mean the welfare of all of our people.

He certainly can do no worse than what we have had for the past 20 years, with an accumulation of an estimated $3 billion worth of foodstuffs and farm products piled up in storage and warehouses to deteriorate and rot.

Certainly there is need for some reorganization and some new thinking and changes to get away from these great losses and devastating programs that have cost the American taxpayers millions of dollars.

This motion should be overwhelmingly defeated to indicate to Secretary Benson our confidence and faith in him to do a real job in the Department of Agriculture. Let us get back to free enterprise and the American way of life.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Michigan, a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am honored; what is it?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Do I understand the gentleman to say in view of the fact that the record of the hearings has been printed, the members of the committee decided it was not necessary to take any other action on this resolution?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what I understood the sentiment of the Republican Members to be.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Oh, the Republican Members?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. You have caucused with them?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How is that?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. You have caucused with them and found that out?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I talked with them and with some of the minority Members of the House and it was my opinion then as it is now that 218 votes against the plan could not be found. If an individual Member opposed the plan as a matter of either expediency or principle he was privileged under the Reorganization Act to demand action. I have no objection because the gentleman did not call up his resolution immediately upon the expiration of the 10-day period. That was for him to decide. All I am doing now is to ask for the defeat of his motion to discharge the committee because, if the motion should prevail, all we will get or gain if it be a gain is just more talk. Why waste time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. May I repeat my question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no; I am almost overcome by the way in which our colleagues on that side of the aisle are supporting the Eisenhower administration they talked so much about the first 2 weeks of this session. That is about all they did talk about. For days we listened to their assertions that they not the Republicans were the President's supporters.

Is today an example of the way they support the President when he sends down a plan; knifing it? Is that the way you gentlemen get behind the President? If this procedure today is a sample of your support, Ike better keep his back to the wall.

You have had 59 days, 59 less the 10 the committee had in which to consider it, to bring this matter up, but you sat on your hands and did nothing. Now you come in and cry because the Reorganization Act—the overall act which every one of you, with one exception who is making this fight, supported—is being used and the result does not suit you. You have had more than one plan come up and go into effect without any adverse

action or without the approval of the committee. That has happened before, and yet here you are yelling about not having an opportunity to debate when all you had to do was act when the plan came down or ask for a vote in the committee. I do not know why you complain now when you know you do not have the votes to defeat the plan and when most of you favor it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I cannot yield; my time is too limited.

Then you use as an argument my statement that I said that hereafter I would offer disapproving resolutions. This is not the first disagreeable job I have had to do, not only for Members on your side but sometimes for some on this side, because you did not have the guts to do it yourself. Now you come along and complain. But I will do it. I am glad to help you out. I think you need the help.

This plan becomes effective if the committee is not discharged. The thing to do is to vote this motion down. Show your support of Eisenhower by something other than hot air by voting against the motion to discharge the committee.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fairly well understood among a lot of us that there is no violent objection to this plan. At least I did not hear any voiced to me. On the contrary, it seemed to me as if pretty much everybody thought the plan should go into effect. As the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations has pointed out, action could have been had in the committee. Therefore, I trust this motion to discharge will be voted down. It is very, very obvious, it seems to me, that you could not possibly muster the constitutional majority to defeat this plan. In view of that circumstance, and the fact this is a substantial plan, I do not know of any reason why anyone should feel constrained to vote for the motion to discharge the committee. I cannot see that anything will be accomplished by voting for the motion, therefore I hope the motion will be defeated so that we can go on with the other business of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to the pending matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, to approve Reorganization Plan No. 2, which was recently submitted to Congress, would place in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture sweeping powers to reorganize and consolidate the agencies in that Department and would mean a complete abdication of congressional prerogatives as to the basic policies of government in the agriculture field. This reorganization is a permanent delegation of power to any person who may hold the position of Secretary of Agriculture. He may shift any agency or any of its functions from one departmental branch to another without submitting such reorganization proposal to the elected representatives of the people for approval. Under this plan, which is now before both Houses of Congress for approval or rejection, an appointive officer is given a blank check.

In 1950, Reorganization Plan No. 4, a forerunner of the present Reorganization Plan No. 2, was submitted to and rejected by Congress. There is little difference between these two plans. Under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, the Secretary of Agriculture would hold hearings before placing into effect major changes in the Department. Partisanship has no place in a decision on this issue. The 1950 plan was not rejected because the Democrats were in power; neither will political considerations be resorted to at this time in approving or rejecting plan No. 2 now that the Republicans are in power and Ezra Taft Benson is the appointed head of the Department.

The Hoover Commission made a careful and intensive study of all phases of the work falling within the scope of the Department of Agriculture. When the Hoover Commission filed its report, it made definite recommendations as to the administrative reorganization of the Department. It recommended that the various agencies of the Department be placed under eight subdivisions. The Hoover plan would have placed in these eight categories the following: Staff Services; Research Services; Extension Services; Agricultural Resources Conservation Services; Commodity Adjustment Services; Regulatory Services; Agricultural Credit Services; and Rural Electrification Services.

The 1953 plan transfers all functions "not now vested in him" except those of hearing examiners, corporations, of the Department, the boards of directors and officers of such corporations, the Advisory Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Farm Credit Administration.

The question is being asked, What functions, if any, will the present Secretary of Agriculture wish to transfer or consolidate? Where will the ax fall? What phase of these functions will be exempt from consolidation at this time, or in the future? Which will be limelighted? Which will be pushed into the background? A plausible approach to this problem would be for Secretary Benson to prepare a departmental reorganization plan in specific terms and ask the President of the United States to submit it to the Congress. Should plan No. 2 be adopted and one or more segments of American agriculture be aggrieved at the action of the Secretary in exercising such unlimited authority, the only recourse would be to enact new legislation. This course would probably require a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress, since the President would probably veto such legislation and acquiesce in the action of his appointed official.

Members of both Houses of Congress cannot shirk their responsibilities. Should adversity ensue, the American farmer would look to his elected representatives to rectify the wrong, and not to an appointed official of the executive branch of the Government. For many years agriculture laws have been enacted which have been of inestimable worth to the Nation's farmers. The many programs set up under these laws were designed to eliminate the pitfalls which resulted in the bringing on of the great farm depression of the early thirties. Agriculture is our basic business, and when it prospers the whole economy is a healthy one.

Any specific plan or reorganization of the Department of Agriculture which would result in more efficiency and economy and in the elimination of duplication would have my hearty support. I cannot lend my support to a proposal which would give unbridled authority to the Secretary of Agriculture as is contained in Reorganization Plan No. 2.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for the Fountain resolution to discharge the Committee on Government Operations in order to make possible proper debate and consideration by the House of the administration's Reorganization Plan No. 2.

Frankly speaking, I am doubtful that I favor the broad authority provided for the Secretary of Agriculture, in view of his reluctance in committee hearings to give details of his plans for reorganization. The opposition of leading Democrats of the House Agriculture Committee to this blanket grant of authority is a persuasive factor in my thinking.

On the other hand, I have been urged by several farm groups in our State to support the reorganization proposal as advanced, and I have no reason to question the sincerity or good intentions of these groups.

I believe the matter is of sufficient importance to our Nation to justify full debate and careful consideration on the floor of this House, as contemplated by the basic Reorganization Act, for which I voted. I believe every Member would benefit from this detailed and careful consideration, and believe we owe it to the farmers of the country.

For this primary reason I am voting for the Fountain resolution, and hope it will be adopted, thereby making possible a full hearing on the merits of this important measure.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 2 submitted by President Eisenhower, providing for reorganizations in the Department of Agriculture. I am convinced just as is the President that reductions in expenditures will result from reorganizations within this Department. I voted, in the early days of this Congress, to extend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that President Eisenhower would have the same powers under the act that were enjoyed by his predecessor. Several weeks ago I supported and voted for the plan to reorganize the Federal Security Agency into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—a Presidential recommendation.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members of the House should have an opportunity to listen to the merits and demerits of the plan. Thus, I intend to vote to discharge the Committee

on Government Operations to make possible full floor debate on this matter. If that motion prevails, I will vote for President Eisenhower's recommended plan for the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, this belated action is not what it is purported to be, namely, a move to obtain more time for debate on the merits of President Eisenhower's plan to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. That sounds good, but it just is not so. On the contrary, all that is sought and intended by this action is to discredit the Eisenhower administration and Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Benson, in the eyes of the American farmer. It is a political propaganda move, pure and simple. If there was any genuine desire to provide an opportunity for the Members of this body to hear and participate in a discussion of the plan itself, action would not have been deferred until the very last day before the plan takes effect.

Personally, I am in favor of the plan. It will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to organize his Department so as to make it function in the best interests of United States agriculture and in the best manner to carry out the laws enacted by the Congress.

I have been very much impressed with the opinion expressed on this matter by the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, a former Secretary of Agriculture and at the present time a United States Senator from the State of New Mexico. Mr. ANDERSON is an honest and able public servant who has had experience in both the executive and legislative branches of our Federal Government. Mr. ANDERSON, being a Democrat, perhaps those on the other side of the aisle who oppose this reorganization plan, will take more heed in what he has to say than what is said on this side. He has expressed himself in favor of the plan. In his testimony before the Senate Committee on Government Operations on May 18, 1953, he had this to say:

> The need for the sort of authority provided in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953—authority to simplify, clarify, and adjust the internal organization of the Department of Agriculture to meet changing needs—has been recognized for a long time by different individuals and groups.
>
> Former Secretaries of Agriculture have recognized this need. Leading farm organizations have recognized it. Members of Congress have recognized it. Students of efficient government—like the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—have recognized it, and have recommended the basic authorities now proposed.
>
> There have been differences of opinion as to methods. There have been fears, sometimes justified, that adequate safeguards were not provided in certain past proposals. But there has been little difference of opinion as to the need to provide adequate flexibility in the authority granted the Secretary of Agriculture to make it possible for him to do a commonsense job of administration. This means the authority to regroup and adjust units and services to meet the currently most urgent problems, as well as the activities directed at long-range objectives.
>
> I want to draw on my personal experience to point out the flexible authority neded by a Secretary of Agriculture. The very fact that the Department covers such a broad scope of service and activities emphasizes this need. Conditions can change very fast. Today's task goes into tomorrow's pigeonhole. National and even international emergencies can and do develop overnight.

I have studied this proposed reorganization plan and see nothing in it which would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to change the laws or to make appropriations—only Congress can do that.

Generally speaking, the plan gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority over the different agencies listed as part of the Department of Agriculture, which he has at the present time over the Office of Foreign Agricultural Service, the Production and Marketing Administration, the Commodity Exchange Authority, and the Agricultural Research Administration.

The argument has been advanced that this plan is similar to a plan which was rejected 3 years ago by the Congress. Although I was not here at that time, my review of the debate on the plan reflects that the opposition thereto was based primarily on the general objection to the centralization of government in Washington.

In this connection, it is important to note that the present plan differs from that defeated 3 years ago in that it directs the Secretary to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels and to adapt the administration of the program of the Department to regional, State, and local conditions.

This provision satisfies, therefore, the principal objection to the plan as it was previously proposed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee from further consideration of the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOUNTAIN) there were—ayes 96, noes 156.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 128, nays 261, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—128

Abernethy	Dodd	Lane
Albert	Dollinger	Lanham
Alexander	Donohue	Lantaff
Andrews	Donovan	Long
Bailey	Dorn, S. C.	McCormack
Barrett	Dowdy	McMillan
Battle	Doyle	Machrowicz
Bennett, Fla.	Durham	Madden
Bentsen	Eberharter	Magnuson
Boland	Edmondson	Mahon
Bolling	Feighan	Matthews
Bonner	Fine	Metcalf
Boykin	Forand	Miller, Calif.
Brooks, Tex.	Forrester	Mollohan
Brown, Ga.	Fountain	Morgan
Buchanan	Gathings	Moulder
Buckley	Gentry	Multer
Burleson	Gordon	Murray
Byrd	Granahan	Norrell
Byrne, Pa.	Green	O'Brien, Ill.
Camp	Gregory	O'Brien, Mich.
Cannon	Gross	O'Hara, Ill.
Carlyle	Haley	Passman
Carnahan	Hays, Ark.	Patman
Celler	Holifield	Pfost
Chelf	Holtzman	Pilcher
Chudoff	Ikard	Poage
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Powell
Condon	Jones, N. C.	Preston
Cooley	Kelly, N. Y.	Priest
Crosser	Keogh	Rabaut
Davis, Ga.	Kilday	Rains
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Rayburn
Deane	Klein	Rhodes, Pa.
Delaney	Kluczynski	Riley
Dingell	Landrum	Roberts
Rogers, Fla.	Steed	Wickersham
Rogers, Tex.	Teague	Williams, Miss.
Rooney	Thompson, La.	Willis
Roosevelt	Thornberry	Wilson, Tex.
Shelley	Trimble	Winstead
Smith, Miss.	Wheeler	Yorty
Spence	Whitten	

NAYS—261

Abbitt	Frazier	Nelson
Adair	Frelinghuysen	Nicholson
Addonizio	Friedel	Norblad
Allen, Calif.	Fulton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Allen, Ill.	Gamble	O'Hara, Minn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Garmatz	O'Konski
Andresen, August H.	Gary	Osmers
Angell	Gavin	Ostertag
Arends	George	Patten
Aspinall	Golden	Patterson
Auchincloss	Goodwin	Pelly
Ayres	Graham	Philbin
Baker	Gubser	Phillips
Bates	Gwinn	Pillion
Beamer	Hagen, Calif.	Poff
Becker	Hale	Polk
Belcher	Halleck	Poulson
Bender	Hand	Price
Bennett, Mich.	Harden	Prouty
Bentley	Hardy	Radwan
Berry	Harris	Ray
Betts	Harrison, Nebr.	Reams
Bishop	Harrison, Va.	Reece, Tenn.
Blatnik	Harrison, Wyo.	Reed, N. Y.
Boggs	Hart	Rees, Kans.
Bolton, Frances P.	Harvey	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Riehlman
Bonin	Hébert	Rivers
Bosch	Heselton	Robeson, Va.
Bow	Hess	Robsion, Ky.
Bramblett	Hiestand	Rodino
Bray	Hill	Rogers, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Hillelson	Sadlak
Brownson	Hillings	St. George
Broyhill	Hinshaw	Saylor
Budge	Hoeven	Schenck
Burdick	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Busbey	Hoffman, Mich.	Scott
Byrnes, Wis.	Holmes	Scrivner
Campbell	Holt	Scudder
Canfield	Hope	Secrest
Carrigg	Horan	Seely-Brown
Case	Hosmer	Selden
Cederberg	Howell	Shafer
Chatham	Hruska	Sheehan
Chenoweth	Hunter	Sheppard
Chiperfield	Hyde	Sieminski
Church	James	Simpson, Ill.
Clardy	Javits	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Jenkins	Smith, Kans.
Cole, Mo.	Jensen	Smith, Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson	Smith, Wis.
Coon	Jonas, Ill.	Springer
Cooper	Jonas, N. C.	Staggers
Corbett	Judd	Stauffer
Cotton	Karsten, Mo.	Stringfellow
Coudert	Kean	Sutton
Cretella	Kearney	Taber
Crumpacker	Kearns	Talle
Cunningham	Keating	Taylor
Curtis, Mass.	Kersten, Wis.	Thomas
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Thompson, Mich.
Curtis, Nebr.	King, Calif.	Thompson, Tex.
Dague	King, Pa.	Tollefson
Davis, Tenn.	Knox	Tuck
Davis, Wis.	Krueger	Utt
Dawson, Utah	Laird	Van Pelt
Dempsey	Latham	Van Zandt
Derounian	LeCompte	Velde
Devereux	McCarthy	Vorys
D'Ewart	McCulloch	Vursell
Dies	McDonough	Wainwright
Dolliver	McGregor	Wampler
Dondero	McIntire	Warburton
Dorn, N. Y.	McVey	Watts
Elliott	Mack, Ill.	Weichel
Ellsworth	Mack, Wash.	Westland
Engle	Mailliard	Wharton
Evins	Marshall	Widnall
Fallon	Mason	Wier
Fenton	Merrill	Wigglesworth
Fernandez	Merrow	Williams, N. Y.
Fino	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Calif.
Fisher	Miller, Nebr.	Wolcott
Ford	Mills	Wolverton
	Morano	Young
	Moss	Younger
	Mumma	
	Neal	

NOT VOTING—41

Barden	Herlong	Lovre
Brooks, La.	Jackson	Lucas
Bush	Jarman	Lyle
Fogarty	Jones, Mo.	McConnell
Grant	Kee	Martin, Iowa
Hagen, Minn.	Kelley, Pa.	Meader
Heller	Lesinski	Miller, Kans.

Miller, N. Y.	Richards	Vinson
Morrison	Rogers, Colo.	Walter
Oakman	Short	Wilson, Ind.
O'Neill	Shuford	Withrow
Perkins	Sikes	Yates
Reed, Ill.	Small	Zablocki
Regan	Sullivan	

So the motion to discharge was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Kee for, with Mr. Bush against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Jackson against.

Mr. Grant for, with Mr. McConnell against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Martin of Iowa against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Wilson of Indiana against.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Small against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Lesinski for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hagen of Minnesota with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Oakman with Mr. Perkins.

Mr. Meader with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Lovre with Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Withrow with Mr. O'Neil.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 234.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that the Rules Committee is waiting for a report from the Committee on Government Operations. If the members of that committee will get over to the committee room, perhaps we can do some business tomorrow.

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT CONCERNING OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 249 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service. This involves a rather small matter and in the opinion of the Committee on Rules the bill should have been placed on the Consent Calendar.

This will not cost the Government very much money to maintain what few lighthouse people there are on the rolls.

I have no further requests for time and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily at this stage of the session I would want to use at least 30 minutes to tell of the accomplishments of the Republican administration but it would take me such a short time to go through with all of those accomplishments and so long to tell of what has not been done that I am so discouraged I shall take no more time, but maybe some of these days this administration will spread its wings and get off the ground and let us know where it is going and how.

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I notice that this bill is designed to provide for the hospital treatment of certain persons who are enumerated therein. So far as I am concerned, I favor the bill, although there are many who would view this bill with hesitancy, particularly those who talk about socialized medicine. I do not think this bill involves the matter of socialized medicine at all.

This legislation is meritorious; it is a step in the right direction; only a limited section of the country will benefit from the operation of the bill; and, above all, it does not in any way enter into the field of so-called socialized medicine. While I am speaking on that subject, which was the main purpose of my rising to make some remarks, I believe it is about time that the American Medical Association and the Republican Party discontinue trying to deceive the American people about the recommendations of former President Truman constituting socialized medicine.

If ever there was a deception practiced upon the people of the United States, it is that charge. If ever there was a political falsehood transmitted to the people of the United States, it is the charge that any recommendation made by former President Truman in relation to hospitalization constituted socialized medicine. Everybody with commonsense knows that the Republican Party used it purely for political reasons, and it was a source of keen regret to me that the American Medical Association, splendid association that it is, lent itself to furthering that charge, which was purely political in nature.

President Truman made certain recommendations. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] introduced a bill carrying out the recommendations, but at all times President Truman said that he was not committed to the particular type of a bill that was introduced; that he felt there was something in the field that should be done; that if anyone had any other plan and the Congress passed it, that it would be acceptable to him. The recommendation he made was a deserving one because it was made during the campaign; the same promise made by the Republican candidate for President. I recognize that there are some who might oppose certain provisions of the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and he recognizes that fact himself. But he introduced that bill in order to concentrate attention upon this important question and for constructive criticism and counterproposal to be made.

On a number of occasions President Truman and Oscar Ewing publicly stated that they welcomed constructive criticism of the bill, they welcomed constructive suggestions, and President Truman said that he would accept any constructive proposal passed by the Congress. So, the facts are that there was no justification at any time of the charge that President Truman and the Democratic Party stood for so-called socialized medicine.

We now see, within the past few days, where the American Medical Association recognizes the fact that something must be done. The new Secretary of the new department, Mrs. Hobby, only within a few days said there was a challenge to the medical profession. I am sure she recognizes that there are 6 million families in America today that have a total family income of $1,000 a year or less; that there are 6,500,000 families in America that have a family income today of less than $2,200, and between $1,000 and $2,200; that there are about 6,500,000 families in America today that have a total family income of between $2,200 and $3,500; in other words, about 19 million American families, representing 90 million of our people, the majority of our people, about 50 percent of the American families, but constituting

over 50 percent of the American people, have a total family income of less than $3,500. When the loved ones of any one of those families get sick, they want them to recover. They want them to have good medical treatment. They love the members of their family just as much as those of us who have a dollar in our pockets love the members of our family. They love the members of their family just as much as the person who is fortunate enough to possess a million dollars loves the members of his family. They are their loved ones, and they are the ones who make up their family life. The amazing thing in America today, powerful Nation that we are, is that there are still 19 million families, not individuals, but families, the little unit of government which is the very foundation of the Government and upon which depends whether the Nation is strong or weak—if there is a strong family life, the Nation is strong, if there is a weak family life, the Nation is weak; but as I was saying, there are 19 million families in America today, 1953, that have a total family income of $3,500 a year or less. When their loved ones get sick, they are concerned about them. It is difficult for them to pay $15 a day or more in a hospital, and I am not blaming the hospital. The hospital has its problems. It is difficult for them to pay $50 for X-rays, and I am not blaming those who charge it. It is difficult for them to pay 2 weeks in advance if a loved one has to go into a hospital, and I am not, as I have said, blaming the hospitals. But what I am saying shows there is a problem in this field which concerns the people of America very much, and that the cry of socialized medicine is just a political bogey. It is about time we forgot that. It is about time that the thinking men and women of America concentrated on this question of 90 million Americans constituting 19 million American families with a total family income which does not enable them to give their loved ones the kind of hospital treatment and care and consideration that they would like to see them get. We can do something to help to see that they get what they need in the American way. So the cry, as I said, of socialized medicine was purely political. Let us forget about that. Let us realize the conditions and the situation that existed in relation to the 19 million American families. Let us try to do something in the American way to help them when their loved ones get sick. So far as this bill is concerned, slight as it is, I am in favor of it. There is no such thing as socialized medicine involved in this bill. It is a step in the right direction, and I hope the House will pass it unanimously.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for explaining this bill so thoroughly, and for the consideration that he and the gentleman from Texas have given me. They have been very kind to me in the short time I have been here, and I appreciate it very much. I do want to say a few words about this. It takes care of a segment of society that we are trying to do something for, and it will not hurt anybody else. I hope everybody will vote for this rule so that the bill can come before us and be thoroughly discussed by Members who know more about it perhaps than you and I, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] such time as he may require.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest men in this Chamber with whom I have had the pleasure of serving is my good friend the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable JOHN L. MCMILLAN.

I have known JOHN MCMILLAN long before he was a Member of this body, while he was serving as the very able secretary to the late Honorable Allard H. Gasque, of South Carolina.

The complete vindication by the courts of our good friend of any wrongdoing or any intent to do wrong was fully justified and expected by all of us who knew of JOHN MCMILLAN'S integrity and his honesty. It is a tragic fact that when any man in public life is accused of any wrongdoing, the charges appear in screaming headlines in our newspapers, while his exoneration and complete vindication of the charges usually rate a dispatch that is nearly buried in other news reports in that portion of the paper that the average reader seldom sees.

The Honorable T. Blake Kennedy, district judge of the United States District Court for the State of Wyoming, has again confirmed the fairness and justice of our courts. Too often prosecution becomes persecution. Congratulations to my good friend, JOHN MCMILLAN. I know he has come through this ordeal a bigger man than ever.

JOHN MCMILLAN is a great man, an outstanding statesman, and one of the great Americans of this Congress and this Nation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment, and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service, with Mr. LECOMPTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] is entitled to 30 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is entitled to 30 minutes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill makes a very simple amendment to the Public Health Service Act, as the Members will see if they will glance at pages 5 and 6 of the report.

Under the present law the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the United States Public Health Service are entitled to medical service and hospitalization in United States Public Health Service hospitals.

As a matter of fact, under other statutes, drug addicts are also entitled to similar treatment; although I never quite understood the philosophy of that legislation.

But the necessity for this legislation, H. R. 1026, which I introduced, arises from the history of Lighthouse Service, which had its origins in the earliest days of the Republic, without going into too much historical facts let me say simply that the Service was run by civilian personnel from 1910 to 1939.

In 1939, the Lighthouse Service, under a reorganization act passed that year, was taken over by the Coast Guard, and since that time the Coast Guard has performed the duties of the old Lighthouse Service, furnishing keepers for the various lighthouses on the coast, of which, as I believe the Members all know, there are a great many, servicing aids to navigation and so on.

Under the existing law, section 710 of the act of July 1, 1944, lightkeepers, assistant lightkeepers, and officers and crews of vessels of the former Lighthouse Service, including any such persons who subsequent to June 30, 1939, have involuntarily been assigned to other civilian duty in the Coast Guard, who were entitled to medical relief at hospitals and other stations of the Service prior to July 1, 1944, and who are now on active duty or who have been or may hereafter be retired under the provisions of section 6 of the act of June 20, 1918, are entitled to medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization at hospitals and other stations of the Public Health Service.

This bill extends this coverage so that such treatment and hospitalization would be provided for those officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service who are now or may hereafter serve on active duty or are now or may hereafter be retired under the provisions of the 1918 act, without restriction as to their former entitlement to medical benefits.

The bill would also extend certain medical, dental, and hospitalization benefits to the dependents and widows of all officers or employees serving or retired under the Lighthouse Service laws.

It is believed, in fact it is certain, that the number of persons who would be affected by this legislation is very small. As of January 31, last, there were approximately 776 living members of the former Lighthouse Service retired under the Lighthouse Service Act of 1918. There are also approximately 300 living widows of former Lighthouse Service employees. Approximately 500 of the

former Lighthouse Service employees are working for the United States Coast Guard in the maintenance of lighthouses and aids to navigation. These 500 are all that remain of some 5,000 members of the Lighthouse Service at the time of its abolition on July 1, 1939.

The retirees of the Lighthouse Service receive pensions of $129 a month and on that pension they cannot afford hospitalization for themselves and their families. The Public Health Service has 23 marine hospitals, 18 outpatient clinics, and 86 outpatient offices.

The Public Health Service advises that no additional appropriation will be required to enable them to take on the very modest burdens which would be imposed under this bill.

At the present time if a man kept a lighthouse sometime prior to the year 1939, he has no right to hospitalization or medical treatment, but if he kept a lighthouse after 1939, and down to the present time, he has such right. That is the anomaly that this present bill seeks to correct. I think it is a piece of simple justice to an extraordinarily faithful, capable service of the United States Government; a body of men who have incurred, in the prosecution of their work, risks and hardships of no mean order.

I hope that the bill will receive the unanimous support of the Members of the Committee and of the House.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] has very adequately covered the provisions of this bill, and I doubt if it is necessary to add further discussion.

The bill came before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and after hearings it was reported unanimously. There was no opposition on the part of the committee to the bill.

This is a simple bill, one that I think does simple justice to perhaps a thousand people in the United States. As I understand, there are perhaps 776 former employees of the Lighthouse Service who were living as of last January, and possibly 300 widows.

I want merely to point out that widows and dependents of these former Lighthouse employees may be eligible for treatment in the Public Health Service hospitals at per diem rates prescribed by the President. I think maybe there might be a little misunderstanding in that connection. That is not a free service to these dependents, but is at a per diem rate prescribed by the President of the United States for patients who are dependents and are treated in these hospitals.

Because of the limited number and frankly because of the age of those who are now eligible for treatment in these hospitals, I think we may reasonably assume that it is a service that will not cost any appreciable sum.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the bill has been adequately explained. I hope it will be approved.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the need for this legislation has been recognized for some time. In fact, the author, Mr. ROBERT HALE, introduced legislation seeking to afford relief to former employees of the Lighthouse Service and their dependents during previous sessions of the Congress.

This bill seeks to aid approximately 800 living members of the former Lighthouse Service who are now retired under the Lighthouse Service Act of 1918. These members have a very small pension. It amounts to $129 a month. On that pension it is impossible for them to buy the necessary medical services needed by their families. It must be recognized that the average age of those who formerly belonged to the Lighthouse Service is getting rather high. In fact, there are only 500 remaining of the 5,000 members originally transferred to the Coast Guard on July 1, 1939, who are still actively employed.

The policy of the Treasury Department is to discontinue employment of personnel under the regulations of the former Lighthouse Service so that within a short time there will be no employees so covered. This legislation will apply to the 500 employees presently employed by the United States Coast Guard, the 776 former Lighthouse Service personnel who are retired under the Lighthouse Service Act of 1918, the 300 widows of former Lighthouse Service employees, and a few individuals not heretofore covered. The Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey employees and certain Public Health personnel are now eligible for benefits roughly comparable to those that will be made available to personnel of the former Lighthouse Service.

It seems equitable that legislation of this kind be enacted so that this rapidly diminishing group of Government employees can be provided with the minimum of health services during their few remaining years.

The cost of this legislation is so nominal that when inquiries were made of the Public Health Service as to their estimate of the added burden that would be placed upon their hospital facilities, the statement was made that the burden would be so small that additional funds would not be required and that they would not request funds for this purpose.

I realize that this legislation has not been endorsed by the Treasury Department and I can understand the reason for their reluctance to approve additional benefits for a group of their employees who are working alongside regular civil-service personnel. However, the transfer of the former Lighthouse personnel to the Coast Guard, a division of the Treasury, should not work to lessen benefits which this personnel would have enjoyed had the Lighthouse Service remained an independent agency and benefits which are now enjoyed by the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service personnel.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple piece of legislation; there is really no issue involved here at all. There was some discussion on the floor a moment ago in the consideration of the rule about the possibility of socialized medicine being involved in this legislation. As the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] said, there is no socialized medicine involved in this legislation at all. There have been several Members who inquired about it throughout the discussion, but I concur with the others that the issue is not involved here.

As has been stated, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that involves simply the extending of medical and hospital service to the former Lighthouse Service employees. The fact remains that a good many of these former employees, as I understand, are now working for the Coast Guard in the Lighthouse Service. Those presently employed under the more recent provisions of the service do have the medical and hospital privileges extended to them by the Public Health Service. I ask the gentleman from Maine if that is not right.

Mr. HALE. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And there are a few of the former members of the old Lighthouse Service under the originally established policy of the country who do not have this service extended to them at this time. Is that true?

Mr. HALE. I think the gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. HARRIS. This merely extends to these former employees the same rights and benefits that present employees receive.

Mr. HALE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the section heading of section 326 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting "former Lighthouse Service," immediately after "Coast and Geodetic Survey,".

SEC. 2. Section 326 (a) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is hereby amended by renumbering paragraphs (2) and (3) as "(3)" and "(4)," respectively, and by inserting the following new paragraph immediately after paragraph (1):

"(2) officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service, including any such persons who subsequent to June 30, 1939, have involuntarily been assigned to other civilian duty in the Coast Guard and who are now or hereafter on active duty or who have been or may hereafter be retired under the provisions of section 6 of the act of June 20, 1918, as amended (33 U. S. C., sec. 763);".

SEC. 3. Section 710 (b) of the act entitled "An act to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1944, as amended, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. Section 326 (b) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Subject to regulations of the President, the dependent members of families (as defined in such regulations) of persons specified in subsection (a), other than temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, and widows (as defined in

such regulations) of deceased persons specified in paragraph (2) of subsection (a), shall be furnished medical advice and outpatient treatment by the Service at its hospitals and relief stations, and they shall also be furnished hospitalization at hospitals of the Service, if suitable accommodations are available, at a per diem cost equal to the uniform rate prescribed from time to time by the President for the hospitalization of dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel at any naval hospital, pursuant to section 2 of the act of May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 80)'."

Page 3, line 1, change "3" to "4."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LECOMPTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service, pursuant to House Resolution 249, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service and for dependents and widows of officers and employees of such Service."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 250 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5069) to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes in order the consideration of H. R. 5069, a bill which will stop the sending of inflammable goods in interstate commerce. The situation has been quite serious in the last few years. It developed that the States could not take care of the matter so it became certain that the Federal Government should look into it. We have a bill before us now which will be properly discussed, I know. So far as the majority is concerned, we have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any requests for time on the rule on this side. As far as I know, there is no objection to the rule.

This is a very important bill. It is one that I think the Members of the House are very much interested in and therefore I think the rule should be adopted in order that we can take it up.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5069) to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5069, with Mr. SADLAK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 5069, now being considered is, in my opinion, one of the most important bills which has been brought before us during this session of the Congress. Its purpose is to protect the public from the dangers surrounding the use in wearing apparel of highly flammable textiles of the types which have caused either bodily injury or death to numerous individuals. The bill is limited in scope to wearing apparel and fabrics which are intended for sale for use in wearing apparel. It will outlaw, for example, the introduction, movement, or sale in interstate commerce of highly flammable children's cowboy playsuits and the so-called torch sweaters or jackets which have caused serious injuries and death to a number of innocent and unsuspecting individuals in recent years.

Legislation seeking to effect this purpose has been before the Congress for several years. At the last session a bill was passed by the Senate and came to the House. It was reported favorably by the House, but in the closing days of the session there was apparently not sufficient time; at least, the opportunity was not given for its passage. This legislation, as I said, has been before the Congress for some considerable time. There have been some individuals above others who have been particularly outstanding in their efforts to procure legislation of this kind. I think it may appropriately be said that our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], was the pioneer of this type of legislation. In the 79th Congress he introduced two bills to eliminate dangerously flammable fabrics from interstate commerce. His second bill was very similar to the one we are considering today. It provided that the Bureau of Standards establish a simple test of flammability to which fabrics must adhere if they were to be shipped in interstate commerce. He has had similar bils in every Congress since. We are pleased to have his support of the bill being considered today, because it is based on so much study and experience with the problem that this bill will solve.

In addition to him the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has likewise been an individual who through a period of years has shown extreme interest in this type of legislation. He has brought to the attention of the committee time and again bills that would effectuate the fundamental purpose of this legislation. At all times he has been helpful and cooperative with our committee in its endeavor to bring before this House satisfactory legislation on this subject. His interest has likewise covered a period of years. His contribution to the subject has been worth while and extremely helpful. We consequently, as a committee, feel greatly indebted to him for his endeavors in behalf of this legislation. There are also other individuals to whom I could properly refer as having made a real contribution to the work of the committee in its consideration of this legislation. Among those I have in mind in this connection is the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who at all times has been extremely helpful.

SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman, this bill has the unanimous approval of the entire Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was introduced by me, chairman of the committee, at the direction of the committee, as a "clean" bill as a result of the committee hearings and after executive consideration of all the bills pending before the committee.

Every witness who testified before the committee during its hearings on this legislation urged prompt and effective Federal legislation to protect the public from the dangers of highly flammable wearing apparel and fabrics used in wearing apparel, and supported, in principle, the bills pending before the committee dealing with this subject. Moreover, the committee was urgently requested to take prompt action on this legislation. It was pointed out that if

this legislation is not enacted, a variety of State and local regulations lacking in uniformity might very well ensue. It seems obvious that uniformity of regulation in this matter is necessary.

Testimony in support of legislation on this subject was received from the Federal Trade Commission, the National Cotton Council of America, the National Retail Dry Goods Association, the Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association, the society of the plastics industry, the rayon and acetate fiber producers, and others.

Favorable reports on this legislation were received from the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Actual experiences in the past show that the risks and possibilities of bodily harm suffered by consumers in the use of highly flammable wearing apparel are severe and most dangerous. Still fresh in our minds is the great wave of burnings and even deaths which children have suffered when wearing highly flammable cowboy playsuits. More recently, there have been a number of cases involving the so-called explosive sweaters which were sold to the public by itinerant vendors. Many incidents, were cited, during our hearings and in the committee's report on this legislation, of tragedies which occurred as a result of the use of highly flammable wearing apparel.

Your committee is advised by the Federal Trade Commission that the authority conferred by existing statutes is not adequate to forestall the introduction of these products into the channels of trade. The Commission can only proceed after the material has gotten into the market. The Commission further advises that the right of applying a temporary restraining order or injunction, or of preventive inspections, is presently not available to it.

Legislation is needed to make it possible effectively to forestall the introduction into the market of these highly flammable products. After the dangerous articles leave the factory and get into one or more of the many channels of trade, it becomes impossible to track them down in time to prevent persons from being badly burned and even suffering death, as in the case of the playsuits which were worn by children when they took fire and resulted in the death of many of them. Legislation in which the corrective power is of a preventive nature is required to be effective in reaching the evil, as well as power to enjoin and stop continued distribution of the dangerous articles.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

The first bill to prohibit the interstate movement of highly flammable fabrics was introduced in the House by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] on March 6, 1945. It was H. R. 2496 of the 79th Congress. The stated purpose of this bill was to prohibit the use of the mails or instrumentalities of interstate commerce for the sale or delivery of any article of wearing apparel, cloth, drapery or other fabric material made from or containing any "hazardous, explosive or other substance in sufficient quantity as to make such fabric or material more highly inflammable than cotton cloth in its natural state." On February 11, 1946, Mr. JOHNSON introduced another bill, H. R. 5445, which declared the transportation of any inflammable textile fabric in interstate commerce to be unlawful. The term "inflammable textile fabric" was defined in the bill as "any textile fabric of combustible fibers which have a nap or pile and which flash or burn in horizontal position with the nap or pile on the upper face at greater average rate than 1 inch per second, the size and condition of samples and methods of testing to be in accordance with the procedure prescribed in National Bureau of Standards Letter Circular No. 818 on Flameproofing of Textiles."

In the 80th Congress, three bills were introduced in the House to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of certain highly flammable textile fabrics. These bills were H. R. 505, by Mr. Canfield, of New Jersey; H. R. 601, by Mr. Johnson, of California; and H. R. 1111, by Mr. Arnold, of Missouri. Your committee held extensive hearings on these bills in March of 1947. The committee recognized the need for enacting legislation on flammable fabrics. However, no bill was reported to the House chiefly because no adequate method of testing the flammability of such textiles was available at that time. Indeed, such a test method was finally approved and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce only 5 months ago.

In the 81st Congress, Mr. JOHNSON, of California, introduced H. R. 4149, relating to this subject. No action was taken by the committee on this bill.

In the 82d Congress, 7 bills on this subject were introduced in the House, namely, H. R. 6076 and H. R. 7256, by Mr. Canfield, of New Jersey; H. R. 6077 and H. R. 7257, by Mr. Johnson, of California; H. R. 6099 and H. R. 7258, by Mr. Seely-Brown, of Connecticut; and H. R. 6290 by Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall, of New York. No hearings were held on these bills by the committee.

On March 26, 1952, Senator JOHNSON, of Colorado, introduced in the Senate S. 2918. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held public hearings on this legislation in May 1952, during which certain amendments were suggested. On June 16, 1952, Senator JOHNSON introduced an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the original S. 2918. This amended bill was circulated to the industry, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Commerce. On June 27, 1952, the Senate committee reported favorably S. 2918 with an amendment, incorporating in the reported bill the amendments suggested by the industry and the executive departments. On July 3, 1952, S. 2918, as reported by the Senate Commerce Committee was amended on the floor of the Senate and passed unanimously.

Your committee reported favorably to the House S. 2918 on July 4, 1952. However, the House took no action on that bill prior to the adjournment of the Congress on July 7, 1952.

In the present Congress, five similar bills were introduced in the House, namely, H. R. 389, by Mr. CANFIELD, of New Jersey; H. R. 2768, by Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey; H. R. 3851, by Mr. CANFIELD, of New Jersey; H. R. 4159, by Mr. JOHNSON, of California; and H. R. 4500, by Mr. WILLIAMS, of Mississippi.

STANDARDS OF FLAMMABILITY

The major problem in formulating legislation to control the use of dangerously flammable textiles is to discriminate between the conventional fabrics that present moderate and generally recognized hazards and the special types of fabrics which present unusual hazards and are highly dangerous.

The rate of burning of a garment or other textile product depends upon the kind of fiber, the finishing materials present, the structure of the yarn and fabric, and such circumstances as the relative humidity. In general, wool textiles ignite and burn with difficulty while cotton and rayon ignite and burn more readily. The major hazards arise from certain cotton or rayon fabrics having fuzzy or furlike surfaces which flash and burn with exceeding rapidity. Most synthetic textiles melt when heated and the molten material is capable of producing serious burns on coming in contact with the skin.

Section 4 of the reported bill prescribes the standards of flammability. Commercial Standard 191–93, promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce effective January 30, 1953, prescribes the standard flammability of clothing textiles and Commercial Standard 192–53, promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce effective May 22, 1953, prescribes the standard of flammability for vinyl plastic film.

Commercial Standard 191–53 is a voluntary standard developed through the combined effort of a number of scientific and technical groups and represents the combined opinion of an industry committee speaking for the cotton and rayon producers, and fabric manufacturers, finishers, converters, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers coordinated by the American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists and the National Retail Dry Goods Association. The National Bureau of Standards participated in this work by active service on technical committees, by the conduct of a wide variety of investigational and testing work, and by aiding in the reconciliation of different points of view.

This standard is the culmination of almost 8 years of continuous experimentation with different test methods and procedures and collaboration among all segments of the textile industry. As finally established, this standard was accepted by cotton and rayon manufacturing and converting groups representing at least 65 percent of the volume of business of this industry. There was no active valid opposition to this standard.

The flammability test provided in the Commercial Standard 191–53 makes use of strips of fabric 2 by 6 inches in dimensions. The test consists of measuring the burning time in seconds when the test

piece is mounted in a specially designed apparatus and a flame is applied in a prescribed manner. Fabrics with a flame spread of more than 7 seconds are classed as having normal flammability. Those with a flame spread of less than 4 seconds are classed as rapid and intense burning, while those burning in 4 to 7 seconds are rated as having intermediate flammability. This bill is directed to those fabrics which are classed as rapid and intense burning fabrics.

Commercial Standard 191–53 states that this standard shall not apply to hats, gloves, and footwear. Notwithstanding this specific exception made in the Standard, this act would provide that this standard shall be applicable to the hats, gloves, and footwear defined in section 2 (d) of this act. Commercial Standard 192–53 makes no exception to hats, gloves, and footwear.

Commercial Standard 192–53 is the industry-approved standard with respect to vinyl plastic film. Such film is used in the manufacture of various articles of wearing apparel such as raincoats, capes, hoods, pants, and aprons. The flammability test, as prescribed in paragraph 3.11 of this standard, provides that the rate of burning of this film shall not exceed 1.2 inches per second as judged by the average of five determinations lengthwise and five determinations transverse to the direction of processing, when tested in accordance with the methods prescribed in that standard.

Section 4 provides further that if at any time the Secretary of Commerce finds that the commercial standards referred to above are inadequate for the protection of the public interest, he shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth his findings, together with such proposals for legislation as he deems appropriate.

The committee intends that the Secretary of Commerce shall make continuous studies of the suitability and effectiveness of these and related test methods in providing adequate protection to the public from the hazards of flammability.

COMPARISON OF BILLS INTRODUCED IN 83D CONGRESS

As previously stated, in the present Congress, 5 bills, namely H. R. 389, H. R. 2768, H. R. 3851, H. R. 4159, and H. R. 4500, were introduced to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of highly flammable articles of wearing apparel and fabrics. As a result of our hearings and after executive consideration of all these bills, I introduced, at the direction of the committee, H. R. 5069, the reported bill.

All six bills are identical in scope; they all seeks to control commerce in highly flammable fabrics.

H. R. 389, by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], is identical to the bill which passed the Senate last year, namely, S. 2918, 82d Congress. The bill which I introduced, H. R. 2768, is practically identical to S. 2918, the only difference being that the Senate approved bill provided for an exemption to exporters who shipped from the United States to any foreign country wearing apparel or fabric made in accordance with the specifications of the purchaser, while my bill makes no such exemption. H. R. 3851, H. R. 4159, and H. R. 4500 are identical bills. They were referred to during our hearings as the revised bills.

I should like to compare the provisions of my bill, H. R. 2768, with the revised bills and the reported bill, H. R. 5069. Sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 of all 6 bills are substantially identical. These sections are explained in the committee report on H. R. 5069 and I shall, therefore, not discuss these sections here. There are, however, substantial differences in the provisions of sections 4, 8, 11, and 12 of these bills. The essential differences in these sections are as follows:

1. STANDARDS OF FLAMMABILITY (SECTION 4)

All six bills provide in section 4 that commercial standard 191–53, promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, effective January 30, 1953, shall be the test standard for determining the lawful or unlawful character of the flammability of clothing textiles under this act. However, my bill, H. R. 2768, authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce to establish test methods, procedures, and standards for determining the rapid and intense burning of wearing apparel and fabrics and to promulgate them. It also provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall not establish any test method, procedure, or standard for determining the rapid and intense burning of wearing apparel and fabrics unless, in his opinion, such test method, procedure, and standard are adequate for the protection of the public interest.

The revised bills, H. R. 3851, H. R. 4159, and H. R. 4500, also authorize the Secretary of Commerce, when in his opinion the protection of the public so requires, to modify or supplement the test methods, procedures, and standards provided in this act by adopting any revision of or amendment to Commercial Standard 191–53, or any new applicable standard. However, the revised bills provide that any modification or supplementation of such test methods, procedures, and standards must be developed under the same procedures which were in effect and used in connection with the establishment of Commercial Standard 191–53. In effect, this means that the Secretary of Commerce may not modify or supplement such test method, procedure, and standard, even though he finds that the protection of the public interest requires it, unless he obtains written acceptances to the modifying or supplementing provisions from the industries concerned, representing at lease 65 percent of the volume of business and with no active, valid opposition being registered. Such are the requirements, under presently existing procedures, for the establishment of commercial standards. Under the revised bills, therefore, the criterion of what is necessary for the proper protection of the public interest is limited and controlled by what the industry will consent to.

In a report to this committee on these bills, the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sheaffer, stated, in part:

> The assent of a large segment of the affected industry is required before standards are placed in effect or modified under presently existing procedures. Where adherence to commercial standards is purely voluntary, this procedure is satisfactory. The required assent to modifications of the standards of flammability by a substantial number of the persons to be regulated by the proposed law raises a question of the constitutionality of the delegation of authority to establish modifications in the standard. The applicable law is not clear. In any event, the policy involved appears subject to question.

Mr. Henry Miller, Assistant General Counsel of the Federal Trade Commission, and Mr. Kenneth F. McClure, Assistant General Counsel for Domestic Affairs in the Department of Commerce elaborated on the constitutionality of this delegation of authority in a memorandum of law which they presented to the committee during our hearings on these bills.

H. R. 5069, the reported bill, adopts the standards of flammability prescribed in the commercial standards promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, identified as Flammability of Clothing Textiles, Commercial Standard 191–53 and General Purpose Vinyl Plastic Film, Commercial Standard 192–53. The latter standard was not specifically mentioned in any of the five bills upon which hearings were held because it had not been promulgated upon to that time. Subsequent to the hearings it was promulgated by the Secretary, effective May 22, 1953.

The reported bill provides, in effect, that should any modification or supplementation of the test methods or procedures prescribed in these standards become necessary in the public interest, an amendment to this act would be required to make them effective. Thus, the objections voiced by the industry to the provision of section 4 of my original bill, H. R. 2768, which would have permitted the Secretary of Commerce, in his discretion, to establish and promulgate test methods, procedures, and standards for determining the rapid and intense burning of wearing apparel and fabrics, are nullified. At the same time, the questions raised on the constitutionality of the provisions in section 4 of the revised bills, are avoided.

The reported bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to report to the Congress any inadequacies in the commercial standards for the protection of the public interest, with recommendations for changes in such standards.

2. GUARANTY (SECTION 8)

All bills contain, in section 8, a guaranty provision. It is designed to relieve from the criminal penalties of this act retailers and other individuals who purchase articles of wearing apparel and fabrics, if they can establish a guaranty received in good faith from the seller of these goods to the effect that they are not dangerously flammable within the meaning of this act. This is a reasonable provision. The tens of thousands of retailers in this country should not be required to become testing experts and to evaluate the goods purchased. The guaranty, however, is voluntary. If a manufacturer does not wish to furnish the guaranty, the retailer has no protection unless he tests the goods himself.

The guaranty provision in my bill, H. R. 2768, provides, in effect, that a guaranty, if issued, would state that each article of wearing apparel and each yard of fabric is not so highly flammable as

to be dangerous when worn by individuals. During our hearings testimony was received from many witnesses to the effect that manufacturers would be unable to furnish a guaranty. Obviously, each item of wearing apparel and each yard of fabric could not be tested. Yet, under the provisions of this bill the manufacturer is asked to guarantee something which he has not tested.

Section 8 of the revised bills provides that a manufacturer may furnish a guaranty to the effect that reasonable and representative tests have been made, under the provisions of the act, and that the specific type of fabric covered by the guaranty was found to be safe. This guaranty protects the retailer who receives goods with the understanding that they are safe. At the same time, the manufacturer is not relieved from the penalties of the act, if he sells or ships highly flammable material.

Section 8 (a) of the reported bill, H. R. 5069, provides that the criminal penalties provided for in section 7 of this act for a violation of section 3 of this act do not apply to any person who establishes a guaranty received in good faith to the effect that reasonable and representative tests made under the provisions of section 4 of this act, show that the fabric covered by the guaranty, or the article of wearing apparel made from that fabric is not so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals. However, should the fabric or wearing apparel be found to be highly flammable, in spite of such guaranty, the Federal Trade Commission would have authority to proceed under the Federal Trade Commission Act as provided in section 3 of this bill, and under section 6 of this bill by initiating injunction and condemnation proceedings, where such proceedings are found to be necessary in the public interest.

The reported bill retains the provision contained in H. R. 2768 providing for a continuing guaranty. The revised bills do not contain specific provisions for a continuing guaranty.

Section 8 (b) of H. R. 2768, although eliminated in the revised bills, is retained in the reported bill, H. R. 5069. It contains the enforcement provisions against the issuance of a false guaranty. Any person who issues a false guaranty is guilty of an unfair method of competition and an unfair or deceptive act or practice in commerce within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The Federal Trade Commission, under section 6 of this act, is authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the administration of this act. The Commission, also, is authorized to make inspections, tests, analyses, and examination of any article of wearing apparel or fabric which it has reason to believe falls within the prohibitions of this act. The Commission should utilize its general rule-making authority, including its trade practice conference procedure, to the extent applicable, for the purpose of aiding and guiding the industry in applying the requirements for making reasonable and representative tests under section 8 of this act.

3. EXPORTS (SECTION 11)

The revised bills provide for an exemption from the provisions of this act to any person who exports from the United States to any foreign country highly flammable wearing apparel or fabric made in accordance with the specifications of the purchaser. My bill, H. R. 2768, and the reported bill, H. R. 5069, do not provide for this exemption. The committee felt that our Government should not put itself in the position of saying that highly flammable goods shall not be sold in the United States because they are unfit for American consumers, but permit these goods to be sold for use by citizens of other countries.

4. EFFECTIVE DATE (SECTION 12)

The revised bills provide that this act shall take effect 1 year after the date of its enactment. H. R. 2768 provides for an effective date of 6 months after the date of enactment. The reported bill, H. R. 5069, provides for an effective date of 1 year after the date of enactment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee testified that the industry will need 1 year's time to acquire testing equipment, and gain experience in evaluating fabric flammability.

CONCLUSION

Your committee believes that the inadequacy of present statutory powers to cope effectively with the urgent problem of protecting innocent and unsuspecting individuals from bodily injury and even death resulting from the use of wearing apparel, and fabrics used in wearing apparel, which are highly flammable makes the enactment of this legislation imperative.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this bill will have, and I believe it will, the unanimous support of the House because it does meet a situation that in the last few years has grown to considerable importance because of the number of catastrophes that have happened throughout the country especially to children and young women and others who have used garments that were dangerously flammable.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I call the gentleman's attention to section 9, on page 11, which is as follows:

SHIPMENTS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

SEC. 9. Any person who has exported or who has attempted to export from any foreign country into the United States any wearing apparel or fabric which, under the provisions of section 4, is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals may thenceforth be prohibited by the Commission from participating in the exportation from any foreign country into the United States of any wearing apparel or fabric except upon filing bond with the Secretary of the Treasury in a sum double the value of said products and any duty thereon, conditioned upon compliance with the provisions of this act.

The question I should like to ask the gentleman is why there should not be a flat prohibition against the importation rather than the posting of a bond, which might permit him to continue the importation of flammable material.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course, the purpose of the committee in placing section 9 in the bill is what the gentleman has already indicated, namely, to preclude from coming into the country any fabrics that would be contrary to the formula describing a dangerous flammable fabric as stated in this bill. The provision for the posting of a bond applies only to individuals who have exported or attempted to export wearing apparel or fabrics in violation of this act. It would also give the importer the opportunity of availing himself of whatever statutes there may be or rules and regulations to determine whether the importation was in fact contrary to the formula that is fixed in the act. It in no way gives any privilege to him.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman not agree that it does permit the exporter to ship into this country flammable material, if he is willing to put up a bond for double the amount of the product to be imported?

Mr. WOLVERTON. No, it does not mean that the fabric or article can move in interstate commerce. It could not move in interstate commerce. It does enable the importer who is alleged to have violated this act to have a determination of the question whether the material does violate the act. The import would be stopped at the port of entry, and when the importer makes bond, it enables him to have the question decided as to whether it does violate the formula.

Mr. GROSS. Then the product would be stopped at the port of entry into this country; in other words, it could not be distributed in this country if the Interstate Commission said that it could not be distributed?

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is my understanding; and the purpose of the committee.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe the gentleman from Iowa said something inadvertently when he referred to the Interstate Commission. The enforcement of this act is under the Federal Trade Commission. Of course, the Federal Trade Commission, as the chairman has said, does not control exports and imports, but they may require that goods meet the test before they go into interstate commerce.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Let me say to my chairman that I think this is a splendid piece of legislation and in the public interest and in the public welfare. I do want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey and the other gentlemen who, over the years, have fought for this legislation, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], on the fine, public-spirited efforts which they have given to this proposed legislation. Let

me say that I know, as the committee members know, that a great deal of time has been spent working out the details of this legislation; first, in the public interest; and secondly, so that it would not be harmful to the industries themselves.

Mr. WOLVERTON. May I say in reply to the gentleman from Minnesota, that I think the admirable results that have been obtained have been obtained because of the very conscientious and able assistance that was given by members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. It is my understanding that the idea for this kind of legislation originated with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]—I do not know about the other gentlemen—through a letter that he received from a constituent. I think that this should be noted very importantly, because a great many people write to their Congressmen, and often nothing happens. But, as I understand, here is a bill which, with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], had its origin in a letter from a mother whose child had been seriously hurt in just such a situation as has been described. I think that should be noted.

I should like to join in congratulating the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], the chairman of the committee [Mr. WOLVERTON], and all these men who have done such a fine job on this bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], who has done such important work and been so helpful in connection with this legislation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, every day of the year thousands of women and children through this land are courting serious painful injury and death simply because, quite unwittingly, they are wearing clothing made of highly flammable fabrics. It is high time that we take the simple and effective action that is needed to keep such potentially dangerous fabrics from being manufactured and off the retailers' shelves.

In the May, 1953, issue of the Woman's Home Companion, Paul W. Kearney has a lead article, captioned "Are You Dressed to Kill?" The first few paragraphs read as follows:

Right now—at the moment you are reading this sentence—thousands of women and children throughout this country are dressed to kill.

Blithely unaware of their danger, they go about their daily work and play wearing highly flammable clothes which can kill or maim them literally in a flash. Death or disfiguration is only as far away from them as the nearest spark. And the distressing fact is that they have no way of recognizing the hazard until too late.

Consider my young friend, whom I'll call Alice Eames. Alice, at the age of 11, has lost 1 year of life. She spent those 12 dreary months lying on her stomach in a hospital bed while skilled surgeons gave her more than 9,000 pinprick skin grafts. She had 35 blood transfusions and lost 40 percent of her weight. Her body will never again be pretty but the surgeons did an amazing job on her face.

Why did Alice have to spend that tortured year in a hospital? Because a year and a half ago her Halloween costume exploded on her back when a boy putting a candle into a hollowed-out pumpkin accidentally brushed it against her.

Three times Congressman GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey, has introduced measures seeking to establish national standards which would ban the sale of hazardous wearing apparel and fabrics. No one has ever opposed them. The important textile interests wholeheartedly endorse the idea. Yet each time the bill has died in committee, yessed to death.

It is, I may add, a problem that has long been with us, and that becomes less and less excusable with every passing day. Twenty-eight years ago at a Christmas party, in a 1-room schoolhouse near Hobart, Okla., 36 persons died because a Santa Claus mask caught fire from a candle, ignited the costume, which in turn touched off the Christmas tree. Many of you remember the epidemic of flash fires of cowboy suits about 1945. In Washington, D. C., alone, 6 little boys were burned to death and 7 others severely burned while wearing cowboy outfits with fleecy highly flammable chaps. A little more than a year ago at least 20 people were burned by torch sweaters that were consumed in 20 to 40 seconds after contact with a match flame. The danger continues. Thousands of costumes, masks, sweaters, and dresses may, if touched by a careless spark, burst into flame. It is impossible for the layman to recognize a highly flammable material until it is too late. But it is not impossible for something to be done to protect the consumer from unknowingly acquiring such hazardous apparel.

Thus far, we must be candid, very little has been done. Only a single State, California, has enacted legislation to protect consumers against the hazard of these flammable textiles. In California there is a law making illegal the manufacture or sale of wearing apparel made with fibers which constitute a dangerous risk of fire and hazard of injury. The question of determining what fabrics are dangerously inflammable has been left in the California State legislation to the State fire marshal. There the marshal has defined as dangerous a garment or fabric which, first, burns at a rate faster than 5 inches in 6 seconds; or, second, ignites within 5 seconds in a specially designed test cabinet. Other special testing apparatus has been perfected to measure burning and ignition rates and elaborate precautions have been taken to make the tests impartial and scientifically sound.

Representatives of cotton and rayon producers, fabric manufacturers, finishers, converters, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers have been working to develop a commercial standard for flammability of clothing textiles, under the coordination of the American Association of Textile Chemists and Colorists and the National Retail Dry Goods Association. They would much prefer a single Federal law utilizing a single standard for flammability than have each State enact a different law with different standards.

Just as we have enacted legislation to protect American consumers from adulterated and dangerous foods and drugs, we can and should without further delay pass a bill protecting our wives and sons and daughters from the danger of flammable materials. I have introduced legislation in the 80th Congress, in the 82d Congress, and again in this Congress to prohibit the interstate shipment and sale of materials so flammable as to be dangerous to the wearer.

The bill now before us and introduced in the name of the committee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], like mine, vests enforcement in the Federal Trade Commission and prescribes the standards of flammability: Commercial Standard 191–53, promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, effective January 30, 1953, for clothing and textiles; and Commercial Standard 192–53, promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce, effective May 22, 1953, for vinyl plastic film.

Legislation of this character is supported by the Federal Trade Commission, the National Cotton Council of America, the National Retail Dry Goods Association, the Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association, the Society of Plastics Industry, Inc., the Rayon and Acetate Fiber Producers, and others.

I am proud to say that the great majority of manufacturers and retailers are heartily in favor of preventing dangerously flammable textiles from being sold to an unsuspecting public. Recently, when fire inspectors showed one manufacturer of "torch" sweaters what he had in stock, he set fire to $30,000 worth of the sweaters in a vacant lot. Responsible retailers likewise generally are alert to screening out dangerous articles submitted by manufacturers who may themselves be ignorant of the hazards they are promoting. This legislation like that I have sponsored would protect these retailers and manufacturers as well as the public.

This is certainly a nonpartisan measure which can be passed quickly without any prolonged debate. It has the backing of the important textile manufacturing and retailing interests. Its sole purpose is to protect American women and children from innocently exposing themselves to the danger of death or horrible disfiguration. It is a piece of legislation that is long overdue. It should be passed without further delay.

In closing, I would like to read a telegram I received from a constituent under date of January 8, 1947:

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We lost our little boy last June through one of the cowboy suits that you are trying to outlaw. We thank you for your efforts to spare other parents the pain that we endured. If I can do anything in any way to further the bill please let me know.

IRVING SUKINIK,
Passaic, N. J.

Do we have to wait longer?

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Let me just add to the words that have already been generously said by others, with reference to my

colleague from New Jersey, the chairman of the committee [Mr. WOLVERTON], and most especially I think the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], who have labored for 4 or 5 years on this bill.

I do not suppose that its benefits would have any more effect on the people of New Jersey than elsewhere. But there has been a great deal of talk about it in New Jersey. There was some real damage done in New Jersey. This is a step, and an important step, to rectify the dangers which have been faced.

It is supported entirely by the textile industry in the gentleman's district and, I may add, is completely supported among the Retail Merchants' Associations of our State, with many others.

I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the committee [Mr. WOLVERTON], and also the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] for their efforts in bringing this bill to the floor and getting it passed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use all of that time, but I do want to take the time to ask the chairman of our committee 2 or 3 questions, the answers to which I believe should clarify the issues.

Am I correct, Mr. Chairman, in stating that the legislation which we now have under consideration was not intended to cover buttons which are affixed to garments which may be made of this flammable material?

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is true.

Mr. KLEIN. The reason I ask that question is because many manufacturers of buttons are somewhat confused as to whether their product is included in the prohibited category.

It is my impression—and I ask the gentleman if that is not the fact—that the reason buttons are not included is because there were no proper standards available with regard to flammability of buttons and that the standards of flammability provided for textile fabrics which are in the bill would not be appropriate to apply to entirely different substances such as the material of which buttons are made?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes; and not only that, but in addition there has been no evidence before the committee to indicate that there was any widespread or particular danger arising from the use of buttons, at least to the extent that applies to the use of fabrics of a highly dangerous character.

Mr. KLEIN. I thank the gentleman. I think that makes it very clear.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I, too, would like to compliment the chairman of the committee and the Members of the House who have sponsored this legislation, who testified before our committee, because this is a very important subject. Many, many parents throughout the country are alarmed at the number of accidents which resulted in children being burned to death in some cases, and seriously burned in others, due to the fact that they were wearing articles of clothing made of flammable materials. There was nothing that could be done by the Federal Trade Commission or any other agency unless they could prove criminal negligence, which was impossible in most cases. There is no other way of preventing the shipment of articles of clothing made of this type of material. This is a very forward-looking piece of legislation and I am certain that every Member of the House will vote for it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in supporting this legislation and commending it to the membership of the House. It is commendable legislation; it is needed legislation. Experience in the past few years, we are sorry to report, has been sad. Certain conditions arose that existing agencies did not have the authority to cope with and, therefore, this problem has come to us over a period of several years.

I think it might be interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that as far back as the 79th Congress this was brought to the attention of our committee and the House. Legislation was proposed then and succeeding Congresses; lengthy hearings have been held, and the complications that developed made it necessary to take quite a long time in working out what we felt would be a satisfactory approach to the problem.

It will be recalled that in the 82d Congress hearings were held and a bill was reported out of our committee. It was near the close of the session; there was some objection raised by certain of the industry and some Members of the House; consequently, we were unable to get the bill up for consideration in the few remaining days of that session. As I understand, the other body did report a bill which was passed in the Senate; and that, too, was presented to our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for consideration.

The question was brought to us by many Members of the House. As I recall, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] took a very active part originally, and our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], as has been stated, took a very active interest in the problem. This matter was presented by the industry. The industry was divided on the approach to the problem, and that made it rather complicated.

The complication was, due largely to the degree of flammability of any given fabric. The standard which had been adopted by the Department of Commerce—and incidentally that took a good long while to be worked out, but the standard which was finally agreed to was satisfactory generally to the industry and almost everyone concerned. We reached the point that the only question we had to resolve was in case there was need for adjustment of the standard to be applied, how should the adjustment be made? We had some very interesting witnesses before the committee who gave splendid testimony as to their position and what would be the effect of the various approaches. Some of the industry thought that should a readjustment of the standard be necessary it should be done after 65 percent of the industry approved it. Then there was the other viewpoint that the agency itself, the department itself, should have the authority to make the adjustment. We have tried to approach that problem in this bill adopting the present standard which has been approved and promulgated by the Department of Commerce, with the proviso that should the Secretary of Commerce decide there was need for changes the problem would be brought back to the Congress and the Congress would make the decision.

That is just about the problem we have before us. This legislation is in just about as good form as we can hope to get it at the present time; therefore I recommend it to the favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I will start my discussion on this bill by first congratulating the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee and the committee for bringing us this bill. Also, I wish to congratulate them especially for the type of bill which they have presented to us here today.

The struggle for the protection of the public from the fire menace presented by dangerously flammable fabrics has been before the Congress since the 79th Congress. I introduced two bills in that Congress in an effort to get the problem solved. I became interested in the problem through a suggestion from Walter P. Jones, the editor of the McClatchy newspapers. His interest stemmed from the fact that California had passed a law that aimed at solving the problem in that State. He felt, and so did I, that the problem was a national one. To effectively solve it, we must prevent fabrics which are dangerous because of their flammability to be shipped in Interstate Commerce.

When I first presented the bill I discussed the matter with Clarence Lea, the then chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He was a Member of the House from California. Mr. Lea took enough interest in the bill to designate one of his committee members, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] to be present in my office to observe a demonstration of a method of testing whether certain cloth was dangerous for human wear because of their flammability. Present at this test were Mr. Ingberg and also Miss Sandholzer who were the ones in charge of flammability problems at the Bureau of Standards. They had devised a standard which the Bureau thought would accurately test whether or not certain cloth which was proposed to be used for human wearing apparel was dangerous. Present were members of the industries manufacturing cotton, wool, the synthetic fiber fabrics, and many other interested individuals including retailers of clothes. These tests convinced us that there was a simple way to test whether cloth which was to be used for wearing apparel was, in fact, dangerous.

The general idea demonstrated at that hearing is the basic idea in the bill before us.

It is also very encouraging to note that the Retail Dry Goods Association of the United States is backing this legislation. This legislation provides for a test to be

made by a Government agency to determine whether cloth which is to be used for wearing apparel is, in fact, dangerous. This is parallel with the idea in the Pure Food and Drug Act, wherein the Government determines, for instance, what type of meat is fit for sale for human consumption and what type is not. Furthermore, a provision of this bill, which is very good, is the one that provides that any change which may be proposed in the flammability test must receive the approval of Congress. The committee did not, by its bill, hand over to any Government agency the arbitrary authority to change the test as to what fabrics are safe. It reserves that right for the Congress. If a change is made, and it is reasonable, it should be aired before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House or the Senate and their judgment should be reflected in an appropriate amendment to this bill in the form of a new test, which would insure the safety of fabrics to be used for clothes.

I do not think it is generally understood that the number of people who have been injured or who have died from injuries from burns due to dangerous fabrics is large. There are no accurate statistics on the matter but that is largely due to the fact that our insurance companies in reporting injury and in paying claims for injuries or death due to burns usually give the nature of the injury as to whether a person is standing near a fireplace, or that they were ignited by standing too near an open gas range—things like that, but, very seldom, until recently, have they indicated that the real cause of the damage was the rapid burning capacity of the fabric which was worn by the individual. Literally hundreds of people have lost their life by injuries sustained by burns due to dangerous fabrics and undoubtedly thousands have been injured in a more or less serious degree due to dangerously flammable fabrics which they wore.

Since the 79th Congress we have continued to introduce bills to try to solve this problem. We had a very exhaustive hearing in one Congress but somehow we were unable to get a bill out of the committee. Finally, I almost gave up in despair but this year I again introduced a bill. The bill which the committee has written, for it is really their work, I consider exceptionally adapted to handling the problem in a simple and very conclusive fashion. It is pleasant to know that something in which I have been intensely interested and something which is a very constructive step will now be consummated, perhaps in this Congress. The other body passed a bill last year and undoubtedly when this bill is sent to the other side of the Capitol, it will receive very favorable reception and I trust it will become the law of the land.

I want to present one matter for thought to those who happen to be listening to what I have to say here today. This is only the beginning of the problem of danger from fire from various types of fabrics, including buttons. It is not generally known but there still are fabrics in homes, such as curtains and in some instances perhaps rugs, which are really dangerous. In the test which we made in 1945 I learned, much to my amazement, that some types of buttons are extremely dangerous. Several were ignited in our presence at that time. I have a very vivid recollection of the intensity with which they burned. If these buttons were on a lady's coat or on her waist and they should get started to burn, it might be almost impossible for the woman to get the clothes off from her body before she would be severely and perhaps fatally burned.

I have no current information but some years past, and I think perhaps still today, some of the toys which are used by children are very dangerous from the standpoint of flammability. I remember when my children were young, I heard a discussion by the State fire marshal of California which aroused my interest and shocked me when he explained how many of the toys that were sold in the open market were extremely dangerous. These should all be taken off the market, and I believe that the people who handle them, especially the retail trade, are hoping that that will happen. The ones who get the brunt of the criticism as well as the expense of this type of injury are the retailers of America. They are the ones who sell it to the customer and who want the safety of the fabric or the buttons. They have no part in manufacturing it, and undoubtedly when they purchased it from the manufacturer or the wholesaler, they assumed that it was fit to wear and not dangerous. The result is that the customer looks to the retailer, the man who sold him the product. Many judgments have been recovered against retailers who are entirely innocent of any wrongdoing whatever. Be that as it may, I firmly believe that the manufacturers of fabrics of the United States are themselves anxious to find ways and means to manufacture things which will not be injurious to the persons that use them. Therefore, this bill is only the beginning of the crusade to make America safe against flammable fabrics, no matter what their form or what their use or where they may be. It is a happy day for me because of my interest going back to almost the beginning of my service in Congress, to find that a bill of this kind will now be passed and undoubtedly will become the law.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the fact that this legislation does not appear to be controversial—everyone seems to be agreed on it—does not necessarily mean, however, that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce merely gave perfunctory consideration to it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I overlooked naming the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] when I was making reference to those who had introduced legislation on this subject. I said that there were others. I had him in mind also, and I want to say at this time that he was very helpful in bringing this matter to the attention of the committee and assisting the committee in bringing about a satisfactory result.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am very grateful to my chairman.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Just to follow up what the gentleman has said, I believe the very fact that there seems to be no great controversy over the legislation at present indicates how thoroughly the committee has worked out controversial elements that might have appeared before bringing it to the House, and to that I believe the gentleman will agree since he was so valuable in helping to work out some of these difficulties.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Except for his flattering reference to me, for which I am most grateful, of course, the gentleman has stated what I had intended to say when I began, but in much clearer and finer language.

Mr. Chairman, we found when we began to consider this legislation, that there were several suggested approaches to the problem confronting us. We found that the industry was in disagreement originally as to the proper approach, and we found that there was some disagreement even among Government agencies that were to administer it. However, the committee did successfully work out these differences to the point where now we have legislation before us in which everybody seems to be agreed and in harmony with.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for belaboring the House further with a detailed discussion of this legislation. It has been very ably explained by my distinguished chairman and other members of the committee. I assume that this legislation will pass unanimously, and if we can get them to take it up in the other body, it should become law soon.

I do want to congratulate the chairman of my committee on the splendid manner in which he handled this highly technical, and at one time, controversial piece of legislation. I think he has done a masterful job and I congratulate him and the members of his committee for a job well done.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, this bill in its present form is a very real tribute to the cooperative efforts on the part of responsible representatives of the industries concerned, Government officials, of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, its staff, and the staff of the legislative counsel. This is attested to by the fact that the House committee was unanimous in reporting the final version. That unanimity should, and I am confident will, justify unanimous action of the House in approving the bill.

There is one phase of the bill which I believe deserves some emphasis because of its importance. In a letter dated April 15, 1953, addressed to the chairman of

the committee, Assistant Secretary of Commerce C. R. Shaeffer wrote, in part:

We wish to invite your attention to the fact that H. R. 4159 and H. R. 3851 provide that the standard of flammability shall be the commercial standard now in effect, and any modification thereof shall be made in accordance with presently existing procedures for the development of commercial standards.

The assent of a large segment of the affected industry is required before standards are placed in effect or modified under presently existing procedures. Where adherence to commercial standards is purely voluntary, this procedure is satisfactory. The required asset to modifications of the standards of flammability by a substantial number of the persons to be regulated by the proposed law raises a question of the constitutionality of the delegation of authority to establish modifications in the standard. The applicable law is not clear. In any event, the policy involved appears subject to question.

An examination of the hearings will indicate that this expression of concern as to constitutionality led members of the committee to examine witnesses closely on the point. As a result, the committee reached a definite policy decision and refused to approve of the procedure originally suggested of permitting future modifications of the standards now in effect, solely under the presently existing procedures for the development of commercial standards. While it was demonstrated to the satisfaction of the committee that commercial standards 191–53, prescribing the standard for flammability of clothing textiles and 192–53, prescribing the standard of flammability of vinyl plastic film had been developed in an entirely satisfactory manner, it will be clear from a wording of section 4 that the committee was firm in its insistence that, should these standards be found by the Secretary of Commerce to be inadequate for the protection of the public interest, he must submit a report to the Congress setting forth his finding, together with such proposals for legislation as he may deem to be appropriate. I believe it may well become a matter of importance, in terms of the legislative history of this legislation, to make it clear beyond any question that the committee was keenly conscious of the significance of the original proposal of delegation of authority to a segment of the industry affected by the legislation and that it has consciously and deliberately declined to accept that suggestion because of its convictions as to the unconstitutionality of any such delegation. I am equally certain that the industry and the public can and will be completely protected by the continuous studies which the committee expects the Secretary of Commerce to make of the suitability and effectiveness of the test methods provided in these standards, and related test methods, together with the specific authority and duty on the part of the Secretary to report to the Congress whenever he finds any inadequacy has developed in the application of these standards. I know that the committee and Congress will be ready always to do whatever may become necessary to improve upon and perfect any procedures in the important field so as to promote the public welfare or to insure a greater degree of safety. However, the committee has also demonstrated its consciousness of its own responsibility to insure that any procedures or methods it recommends to the House meet the requirements of the Constitution. In that way only can the public welfare be best guaranteed.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, it is a very real privilege and pleasure for me to be associated with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the first time this year. This committee has done a magnificent job under the very capable leadership of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and the members of the committee have been most earnest, sincere, and dedicated to doing this kind of a job. I say this for both the majority and the minority members of the committee. I have not seen anywhere a greater degree of dedication to the real service of the country than has been the case by the members of this committee.

This particular piece of legislation could easily have become bogged down in a maze of controversial things, but the fine work of the members of the committee prevented that, and the legislation which has been brought out has been brought out only after the most careful consideration.

In two instances I asked two different chiefs of fire departments in my district if they would like to comment on this legislation. I call attention of the Members of the House to their letters which are inserted in the hearings on this bill on pages 196 and 197 in which these two chiefs of fire departments recommended that this type of legislation be passed unanimously and quickly and gave reasons why it was most important.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, we do not have any further requests for time on this side.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think the legislation now before us is a good example of the kind of work that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has to deal with in its deliberations as a committee of this House. Out of that committee came the first wool labeling bill many years ago. At that time the legislation was highly controversial. Since then it has had the very strong support of both the public and the industries that might be affected thereby. I had the privilege and honor of being the author of the fur labeling bill. It took some 5 years of legislative work and hearings before that bill finally became law. Having some personal experience and interest in that legislation, let me say that oftentimes it does make for better legislation if it does take a little time before a bill becomes law because generally speaking the conflicts and mistakes which might be made without extensive hearings are avoided or resolved as a result of extensive consideration and hearings. As has been so well pointed out by my colleagues, the present legislation is unquestionably a much better piece of legislation as a result of the consideration which has been given to it by the committee and by the industry and by the departments of Government affected in its administration. As a result, we have before us legislation which I think has been carefully considered, and frankly considered from a practical viewpoint. If it is administered, and I have every confidence that it will be fairly administered by the Federal Trade Commission, we will have a law upon the books that will be of great benefit to the public and which, I think, will have the uniform cooperation and support of the industries affected as well as the hearty approval of the public.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment again those who have spent a great deal of time upon this legislation, and to congratulate them on the fine result which has been obtained.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked by several of my constituents interested in H. R. 5069, entitled "The Flammable Act," to make inquiry as to whether or not this bill does include, or is intended to include, buttons on garments or wearing apparel. In response to such correspondence, I made inquiry of the chairman, and during the debate the gentleman from New York, Congressman KLEIN, a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, propounded several questions to clarify the point. I myself have received a written communication from the chairman to the effect that the committee did not accept an amendment to include buttons within the purview of the bill. I append herewith the letter from the chairman, dated June 3, 1953:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., June 3, 1953.

Hon. SIDNEY A. FINE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Reference is made to your letter of June 1, 1953, inquiring whether buttons on wearing apparel are included in the provisions of H. R. 5069, a bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes.

The provisions of this bill are limited to articles of wearing apparel and fabrics. These terms are defined in the bill as follows:

"(d) The term 'article of wearing apparel' means any costume or article of clothing worn or intended to be worn by individuals except hats, gloves, and footwear: *Provided, however,* That such hats do not constitute or form part of a covering for the neck, face, or shoulders when worn by individuals: *Provided further,* That such gloves are not more than 14 inches in length and are not affixed to or do not form an integral part of another garment: *And provided further,* That such footwear does not consist of hosiery in whole or in part and is not affixed to or does not form an integral part of another garment.

"(e) The term 'fabric' means any material (other than fiber, filament, or yarn) woven, knitted, felted, or otherwise produced from

or in combination with any natural or synthetic fiber, film, or substitute therefor which is intended or sold for use in wearing apparel except that interlining fabrics when intended or sold for use in wearing apparel shall not be subject to this act."

During our hearings on this legislation Mr. W. P. Fickett, representing the National Association of Button Manufacturers, appeared before the committee and urged that this legislation be amended to include buttons as well as fabrics and wearing apparel. The committee did not adopt his amendment.

You will find Mr. Fickett's testimony beginning with page 182 of our hearings on this legislation. A copy each of the hearings and H. R. 5069 are enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Flammable Fabrics Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other form of business enterprise.

(b) The term "commerce" means commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, or in any Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory and any State or foreign nation, or between the District of Columbia and any State or Territory or foreign nation.

(c) The term "Territory" includes the insular possessions of the United States and also any Territory of the United States.

(d) The term "article of wearing apparel" means any costume or article of clothing worn or intended to be worn by individuals except hats, gloves, and footwear: *Provided, however,* That such hats do not constitute or form part of a covering for the neck, face, or shoulders when worn by individuals: *Provided further,* That such gloves are not more than 14 inches in length and are not affixed to or do not form an integral part of another garment: *And provided further,* That such footwear does not consist of hosiery in whole or in part and is not affixed to or does not form an integral part of another garment.

(e) The term "fabric" means any material (other than fiber, filament, or yarn) woven, knitted, felted, or otherwise produced from or in combination with any natural or synthetic fiber, film, or substitute therefor which is intended or sold for use in wearing apparel except that interlining fabrics when intended or sold for use in wearing apparel shall not be subject to this act.

(f) The term "interlining" means any fabric which is intended for incorporation into an article of wearing apparel as a layer between an outer shell and an inner lining.

(g) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(h) The term "Federal Trade Commission Act" means the act of Congress entitled "An act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," approved September 26, 1914, as amended.

PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 3. (a) The manufacture for sale, the sale, or the offering for sale, in commerce, or the importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation or causing to be transported in commerce or for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale in commerce, of any article of wearing apparel which under the provisions of section 4 of this act is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The sale or the offering for sale, in commerce, or the importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation or causing to be transported in commerce or for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale in commerce, of any fabric which under the provisions of section 4 of this act is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(c) The manufacture for sale, the sale, or the offering for sale, of any article of wearing apparel made of fabric which under section 4 is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals and which has been shipped or received in commerce shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

STANDARD OF FLAMMABILITY

SEC. 4. (a) Any fabric or article of wearing apparel shall be deemed so highly flammable within the meaning of section 3 of this act as to be dangerous when worn by individuals if such fabric or any uncovered or exposed part of such article of wearing apparel exhibits rapid and intense burning when tested under the conditions and in the manner prescribed in the Commercial Standard promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce effective January 30, 1953, and identified as "Flammability of Clothing Textiles, Commercial Standard 191–53" or in the Commercial Standard promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce effective May 22, 1953, and identified as "General Purpose Vinyl Plastic Film, Commercial Standard 192–53." For the purposes of this act, such Commercial Standard 191–53 shall apply with respect to the hats, gloves, and footwear covered by section 2 (d) of this act, notwithstanding any exception contained in such Commercial Standard with respect to hats, gloves, and footwear.

(b) If at any time the Secretary of Commerce finds that the Commercial Standards referred to in subsection (a) of this section are inadequate for the protection of the public interest, he shall submit to the Congress a report setting forth his findings together with such proposals for legislation as he deems appropriate.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, sections 3, 5, 6, and 8 (b) of this act shall be enforced by the Commission under rules, regulations and procedures provided for in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The Commission is authorized and directed to prevent any person from violating the provisions of section 3 of this act in the same manner, by the same means and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this act; and any such person violating any provision of section 3 of this act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in said Federal Trade Commission Act as though the applicable terms and provisions of the said Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this act.

(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for purposes of administration and enforcement of this act.

(d) The Commission is authorized to—

(1) cause inspections, analyses, tests, and examinations to be made of any article of wearing apparel or fabric which it has reason to believe falls within the prohibitions of this act; and

(2) cooperate on matters related to the purposes of this act with any department or agency of the Government; with any State, Territory, or possession or with the District of Columbia; or with any department, agency, or political subdivision thereof; or with any person.

INJUNCTION AND CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any person is violating or is about to violate section 3 of this act, and that it would be in the public interest to enjoin such violation until complaint under the Federal Trade Commission Act is issued and dismissed by the Commission or until order to cease and desist made thereon by the Commission has become final within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act or is set aside by the court on review, the Commission may bring suit in the district court of the United States or in United States court of any Territory for the district or Territory in which such person resides or transacts business, to enjoin such violation and upon proper showing a temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond.

(b) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any article of wearing apparel has been manufactured or introduced into commerce or any fabric has been introduced in commerce in violation of section 3 of this act, it may institute proceedings by process of libel for the seizure and confiscation of such article of wearing apparel or fabric in any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such article of wearing apparel or fabric is found. Proceedings in cases instituted under the authority of this section shall conform as nearly as may be to proceedings in rem in admiralty, except that on demand of either party and in the discretion of the court, any issue of fact shall be tried by jury. Whenever such proceedings involving identical articles of wearing apparel or fabrics are pending in two or more jurisdictions, they may be consolidated for trial by order of any such court upon application seasonably made by any party in interest upon notice to all other parties in interest. Any court granting an order of consolidation shall cause prompt notification thereof to be given to other courts having jurisdiction in the cases covered thereby and the clerks of such other courts shall transmit all pertinent records and papers to the court designated for the trial of such consolidated proceedings.

(c) In any such action the court upon application seasonably made before trial shall by order allow any party in interest, his attorney or agent, to obtain a representative sample of the article of wearing apparel or fabric seized.

(d) If such articles of wearing apparel or fabrics are condemned by the court they shall be disposed of by destruction, by delivery to the owner or claimant thereof upon payment of court costs and fees and storage and other proper expenses and upon execution of good and sufficient bond to the effect that such articles of wearing apparel or fabrics will not be disposed of for wearing apparel purposes until properly and adequately treated or processed so as to render them lawful for introduction into commerce, or by sale upon execution of good and sufficient bond to the effect that such articles of wearing apparel or fabrics will not be disposed of for wearing apparel purposes until properly and adequately treated or processed so as to render them lawful for introduction into commerce. If such products are dis-

posed of by sale the proceeds, less costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. Any person who willfully violates section 3 or 8 (b) of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $5,000 or be imprisoned not more than 1 year or both in the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall limit other provisions of this act.

GUARANTY

SEC. 8. (a) No person shall be subject to prosecution under section 7 of this act for a violation of section 3 of this act if such person (1) establishes a guaranty received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person by whom the wearing apparel or fabric guaranteed was manufactured or from whom it was received, to the effect that reasonable and representative tests made under the procedures provided in section 4 of this act show that the fabric covered by the guaranty, or used in the wearing apparel covered by the guaranty, is not, under the provisions of section 4 of this act, so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and (2) has not, by further processing, affected the flammability of the fabric or wearing apparel covered by the guaranty which he received. Such guaranty shall be either (1) a separate guaranty specifically designating the wearing apparel or fabric guaranteed, in which case it may be on the invoice or other paper relating to such wearing apparel or fabric; or (2) a continuing guaranty filed with the Commission applicable to any wearing apparel or fabric handled by a guarantor, in such form as the Commission by rules or regulations may prescribe.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to furnish, with respect to any wearing apparel or fabric, a false guaranty (except a person relying upon a guaranty to the same effect received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person by whom the wearing apparel or fabric guaranteed was manufactured or from whom it was received) with reason to believe the wearing apparel or fabric falsely guaranteed may be introduced, sold, or transported in commerce, and any person who violates the provisions of this subsection is guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

SHIPMENTS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

SEC. 9. Any person who has exported or who has attempted to export from any foreign country into the United States any wearing apparel or fabric which, under the provisions of section 4, is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals may thenceforth be prohibited by the Commission from participating in the exportation from any foreign country into the United States of any wearing apparel or fabric except upon filing bond with the Secretary of the Treasury in a sum double the value of said products and any duty thereon, conditioned upon compliance with the provisions of this act.

INTERPRETATION AND SEPARABILITY

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act shall be held to be in addition to, and not in substitution for or limitation of, the provisions of any other law. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid the remainder of the act and the application of such provisions to any other person or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EXCLUSIONS

SEC. 11. The provisions of this act shall not apply (a) to any common carrier, contract carrier, or freight forwarder with respect to an article of wearing apparel or fabric shipped or delivered for shipment into commerce in the ordinary course of its business; or (b) to any converter, processor, or finisher in performing a contract or commission service for the account of a person subject to the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That said converter, processor, or finisher does not cause any article of wearing apparel or fabric to become subject to this act contrary to the terms of the contract or commission service; or (c) to any article of wearing apparel or fabric shipped or delivered for shipment into commerce for the purpose of finishing or processing to render such article or fabric not so highly flammable, under the provisions of section 4 of this act, as to be dangerous when worn by individuals.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect 1 year after the date of its passage.

AUTHORIZATION OF NECESSARY APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. WOLVERTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 5, line 3, strike out the word "in" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "exhibits a rate of burning in excess of that specified in paragraph 3.11 of."

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been read makes no change in policy or in substance so far as the bill is concerned. It is merely for the purpose of supplying language to make a correct reference to the flammability standards in commercial standard 192–53 identified as general purpose vinyl plastic.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SADLAK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5069) to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 250, he reported the same back to the House, with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of inserting their remarks in the RECORD at that point in the general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file its report on the bill H. R. 3203, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], representing the minority, may have a similar privilege to file a minority report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, about a year ago this body clearly expressed its will with respect to continued United States participation in the International Materials Conference. While the Defense Production Act was under consideration the House adopted by teller vote of 160 to 102 an amendment which I introduced to prevent the IMC from using the Defense Production Act to implement its international allocations.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall the statements of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], who has contributed so much to the development of our stockpiling laws that the International Materials Conference interfered with our stockpiling program, which was authorized by Public Law 520, 79th Congress. Stockpiling of strategic materials is vital to our security.

Many of us were sure that, in spite of the IMC and its entitlements to consumption, copper allocated to the European nations at the expense of our citizens was going behind the Iron Curtain. Life magazine, in a feature article by David Douglas Duncan on January 26, 1953, finally proved that this was the case. I am indebted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who inserted this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 2. This article referred to those who assisted Russia in obtaining these critical materials as "sixth columnists." Let me read what Life said about one of them:

We can consider here the case of Josef Cremer, who, I am told on good authority, is the most active of all the sixth columnists now at work. * * *

Cremer has had a standing contract to supply 1,000 tons of copper a month to the Communists in Prague. He will also deal in

practically anything else. He even jests about his activities as he once did with the Communist boss to whom he was delivering the copper. "I see you're getting fat," said the Communist. Cremer laughed loud and long. "We're all getting fat," he said. "You with my copper. We with your money."

Mr. Speaker, remember while Russia was "getting fat" on the copper allocated to Europe by the International Materials Conference, American workers in the brass mills in my State and in the automobile plants in Michigan were losing their jobs.

In the Life article, Mr. Duncan attempted to estimate the magnitude of this East-West trade. He said:

One expert, with no special ax to grind, gave me the estimate that the total sixth column trade to East Germany amounted to $225 million in 1951. This he figured, included $7,500,000 worth of highly critical machinery and $15 million worth of chemicals, plus some 32,500 tons of copper, zinc, aluminum, mercury, bronze, cobalt and cadmium. For 1952 my source thought, the illegal trade was perhaps a third higher than this. Exactly how much of the goods comes from West Germany is unknown. It is certainly larger than the German authorities and our Eastern Economic Division would like to think.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that bronze, copper, zinc, and cobalt were all IMC materials and supposedly allocated to strengthen the free world.

When the conference report on this legislation was submitted, the language of our amendment had been modified so that the final Defense Production Act did not effectively limit our participation in the International Materials Conference. The House was not satisfied with this action. The gentleman from North Carolina showed us that the Defense Production Act did not authorize the International Materials Conference, but it merely recognized its existence. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], now the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, made a motion to recommit the fiscal 1953 appropriations bill for the State Department so that language originally proposed by the other body could be inserted to read as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay any expense incident to, or in connection with, the participation in the International Materials Conference.

I want to remind the Members of this House that on July 3 when we were ready to adjourn, we thought it sufficiently important to instruct our conferees to adopt an amendment proposed by the other body when we recommitted this appropriation bill by a rollcall vote of 184 to 157. I want to particularly remind my colleagues on this side of the aisle that 153 of us voted for this action and 29 of us were paired in its favor. Our conferees returned after further deliberation and accepted this amendment. In addition the report of the conferees said:

The conferees on the part of both Houses agree on Senate amendment No. 18 and it is the intention of the conferees that the wording of the amendment will not preclude the Department of State from observing the activities of the International Materials Conference in the same manner and to the same extent that the United States might observe the activities of other international organizations to which the United States does not belong.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the conferees clearly indicated that our relationship to the International Materials Conference was that of an observer, and that this was an international organization to which the United States does not belong. I need not remind you, Mr. Speaker, that Senate Document No. 166 which was prepared by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire and yourself describing the record of our party in the 82d Congress commented on its action in dealing with the International Materials Conference, as follows:

Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, in the Senate, and Republicans in the House sought to prevent our State Department from using the defense program to bring about international control of basic materials without authority from Congress.

Republicans took other action in the world-trade field as it affects our program of allocating scarce materials. House Republicans formed four committees to look into the activities of the International Materials Conference. These Republicans discovered that the IMC is using the defense emergency to bring about international planning and international rationing of basic materials, including some that are produced in the United States, with the result that it was costing Americans thousands of jobs.

Republicans, adhering to the principle that our industries are entitled to justice in the scramble for key materials around the world, battled in the Senate and House to prevent discrimination against American producers and labor by the IMC.

As a result of Republican efforts in the 82d Congress, workers in the automobile plants in Michigan and workers in many other industries now have a better chance to hold their jobs.

Republicans will not allow the American economy to be throttled or world government to be fastened upon the American people by measures taken without congressional authority or under the pretext of national defense.

My purpose in requesting this time today is to review the activities of the International Materials Conference since the Congress so clearly expressed its will in connection with our continued participation in this organization.

I am happy to be able to inform my colleagues that 5 of the original 7 IMC committees, those dealing with wool, cotton, newsprint, sulfur, copper, lead, and zinc have been disbanded. The central group of the International Materials Conference, however, is still in being as well as the Tungsten-Molybdenum Committee and the Manganese-Nickel-Cobalt Committee. International allocations are continuing for both nickel and molybdenum.

I am concerned that the International Materials Conference has not been disbanded and I have carefully reviewed its second report on operations which was recently issued, as well as a report by the United States delegate to the International Materials Conference, Mr. Winant. He replaced Mr. King as United States delegate to the central group on November 3, 1952, just 1 day before the national election. Mr. Winant was elected a vice chairman of the International Materials Conference at a meeting of the central group on March 5, 1953.

Mr. Winant's report entitled "A summary statement on the IMC through December 31, 1952," is dated January 5, 1953, 15 days before our new administration was inaugurated. Mr. Winant's justification of United States financing of the International Materials Conference in this report is most illuminating. He said:

The United States share of total IMC expenses, previously borne by the State Department, had been planned for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, in terms of a contribution of 57 United States personnel to a total IMC staff of 75. Upon congressional action denying the use of State Department funds for IMC purposes, DPA agreed to take over the responsibility of providing the IMC with the minimum necessary United States personnel on condition that other interested agencies in Government would share in the cost. Subsequently, arrangements were concluded between the Defense Production Administration and the Office of Defense Mobilization, Office of the Director for Mutual Security and the Department of Commerce for the establishment of a working fund, under DPA administration, to support a United States personnel contribution to the IMC staff of not exceeding 25 in the quarter ending September 30, 1952, and further reduced personnel thereafter.

Assumption of this administrative responsibility by DPA is in addition to, and consistent with, its directive responsibility for United States participation in the IMC, and is also consistent with the continued participation anticipated by the amendment to the Defense Production Act quoted above.

In other words, Mr. Winant believes that although the intent of Congress in denying funds to the State Department was unmistakable, that the Truman administration was justified in using funds from the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Mutual Security Agency and the Department of Commerce to support a United States personnel contribution to the International Materials Conference staff in addition to the personnel in the Defense Production Administration, who represent the United States in the International Materials Conference. This is an amazing statement from any public servant.

The International Materials Conference, in its second year's report attempts to justify the continued existence of the central group and explains that it may recommend what committees should be formed or reconstituted. In other words Mr. Speaker, as long as this central group is in existence new commodity committees may be formed at its pleasure and discretion.

As I have already stated, only two commodities are today under international allocation—nickel and molybdenum. Most of the world's nickel is produced in Canada. In fact, one producer—the International Nickel Co.— is the principal supplier. Ninety-eight percent of the world's molybdenum is furnished by two countries—the United States and Chile. The United States, alone, supplies 92 percent of the free world supply. Only two or three firms produce the entire world output.

I think the time has come when an International Materials Conference is not required to allocate such materials among the free nations of the world.

Furthermore, the elimination of controls here in the United States will make it impossible for us to effectively implement such allocations.

The International Materials Conference have always professed an intention to disband as soon as their job is done. I was naturally surprised to find that new quarters were opened by the IMC on May 4 on the eighth floor of the Lafayette Building, 811 Vermont Avenue. Obviously the International Materials Conference is not planning to disband if it is opening new offices at this time.

The London Economist, a leading British business paper which has often called the turn where plans of the International Materials Conference are concerned, said in its issue of April 25, 1953:

> But if the two last allocation committees are presently wound up it will still be pertinent to consider whether, on strategic, and on economic grounds, some form of international secretariat may be desirable to continue the study of raw materials which have been, and may again become, scarce.

If we have an all-out war, there will, of course, be need for international allocations of materials and for controls of many kinds. Under today's conditions, the President has clearly indicated that he does not favor such standby measures as have been suggested by the London Economist.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House that when we recently passed the 1954 appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, H. R. 4974, this body again included in section 111 the same provision against the use of any funds under this title for the operation of the International Materials Conference as we inserted in the 1953 act.

The time has come when the will of Congress must not be thwarted by devious devices, such as those outlined in Mr. Winant's report, whereby funds from other agencies are used to maintain an organization which the Congress has clearly shown we do not wish to support.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to cut expenses to give the American people a tax cut as soon as possible. Here is one place where we can disband a useless, unauthorized international agency and can show our faith in free markets which should be relied upon to allocate materials—short of an all-out war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BEAMER and to include an editorial.

Mr. BENTLEY in two instances.

Mr. BRAY.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. KEARNEY.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK and to include an article.

Mr. ASPINALL in two instances and to include extraneous material in each instance.

Mr. POWELL and to include a letter.

Mr. HALLECK and to include certain editorials.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances.

Mr. WOLVERTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD and to include two articles and an editorial.

Mr. HOLTZMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and to include two articles.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. D'EWART in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PILLION and to include a statement.

Mr. FINO and to include a statement.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include a letter which he received from a resident of Arlington County.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. DONOHUE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOWELL and to include an editorial.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl; and

H. R. 2366. An act for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 261. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood-control contract;

S. 380. An act to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans.;

S. 484. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Colorado to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States;

S. 1292. An act providing for the reconveyance to the town of Morristown of certain land included within the Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey;

S. 1334. An act for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith;

S. 1545. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington parish burial ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots; and

S. 1870. An act to extend the time for filing a report by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel established by the act of July 16, 1952.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 4, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

738. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1954 and for other purposes, in the amount of $15,359,330, together with several proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 162); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

739. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a report of the proceedings of a special session of the Judicial Conference of the United States held on May 8, 1953, pursuant to a resolution adopted by the Judicial Conference (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

740. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 30, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a preliminary examination and survey of Patchogue River, Conn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on July 24, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 164); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

741. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to amend Public Law 472, 81st Congress, approved April 11, 1950, entitled 'An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for reseach and study' "; to the Committee on Armed Services.

742. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

743. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending March 31, 1953, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

744. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide public assistance to needy persons in the District of Columbia, and for other

purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Leon H. Callaway, Irwin F. Hall, Sylvester T. Harlin, Robert B. How and Edward S. Waldron"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

746. A letter from the clerk, office of the Clerk, United States Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the court's opinion entered in the case of *Mrs. Rosario Cusimano* v. *The United States* (Congressional No. 17868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

747. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

748. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1802. A bill to amend the act of Congress approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 5456. A bill to extend to June 30, 1954, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 639. An act to provide for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware; without amendment (Rept. No. 502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VORYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 234. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union for the year 1953, to be held in Washington, D. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 4406. A bill to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources; with amendment (Rept. No. 504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 992. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; with amendment (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 265. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5141. A bill to create the Small Business Administration and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; without amendment (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 266. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4406, a bill to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources; without amendment (Rept. No. 507). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 267. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 992, a bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 508). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 268. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5304, a bill to permit members of the Armed Forces to elect certain contingency options, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 509). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 269. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3770, a bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 510). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 3770. A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 5528. A bill to provide that certain former members of the uniformed services shall be notified if they have claims against the United States for amounts due them because of military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5529. A bill to preserve within Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va., the most important historic properties relating to the Battles of Manassas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5530. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that certain gains and losses in respect of contracts for the sale of real property, or in respect of mortgages on real property, shall be capital gains and losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 5531. A bill for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Hamilton County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 5532. A bill to modernize the charter of Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 5533. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act so as to increase benefit payments by revising the method for computing an individual's average monthly wage so as to use the best 10 consecutive years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5534. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain duties upon the importation of aluminum and aluminum alloys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 5535. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to guarantee loans made to certain veterans for the purchase of trailers to be used as homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 5536. A bill to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5537. A bill to provide an income-tax basis of certain trusts subject to the Federal estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5538. A bill to provide for voluntary contributions of an employer to an employee's stock bonus or profit-sharing trust; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 5539. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings for housing of Federal agencies or departments, including post offices, by executing purchase contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 5540. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system of child's insurance benefits to children who have attained the age of 18 but are incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. Res. 260. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to Eva Bush, sister of Walter Puckett, late an employee of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 261. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 262. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 263. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 9 of 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 264. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal taxes on the transportation of persons and property as each affects interisland transportation in Hawaii and between Hawaii and the mainland United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 5541. A bill for the relief of Laura Olivera Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 5542. A bill for the relief of Anthony S. Jarana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5543. A bill for the relief of Regina Hochsztein (also known as Regina Tenenbaum) and Chaim Hochsztein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5544. A bill for the relief of Jacob Fraim Zubli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 5545. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5546. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Helena Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 5547. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thamena Hanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 5548. A bill for the relief of Samuel Kaufman, Mrs. Pepa Kaufman, and Meyer Kaufman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5549. A bill for the relief of Ervin Eckstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 5550. A bill for the relief of Simone Gilliland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5551. A bill for the relief of Raul Conde, Esperanza J. Conde, and Araceli Conde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 5552. A bill for the relief of John Hatgegeorge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 5553. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lu Jen-lung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5554. A bill for the relief of Zaza A. Brillanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5555. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Costas Melachrinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1953

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 28, 1953

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast led us out of bondage with a vision of man's righteousness, Thou who hast taught us that we are faithful children of a just God only when we labor for liberty and justice for all, guide us in our deliberations so that we shall clear the path that leads upward, the way that builds new strength and new hope for the children of men.

O Thou who hast led us across the Red Seas and the wilderness of the yesteryears in a vision of a covenant with Thy law, quicken that vision in our minds so that with renewed faith we will be the living witnesses of that covenant in our lives; a covenant that will inspire freemen toward a rebirth of freedom to face the promise and the dangers of a new age.

We pray in the hope of our fathers that we shall preserve the freedoms our fathers have won, and raise a standard for the wise and the honest freemen of our day; so that through our labors a just peace shall be to him who is far and to him who is near, and the time shall soon come when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of a righteous God even as the waters cover the seas. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 3, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1026. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service and for dependents and widows of officers and employees of such Service; and

H. R. 5069. An act to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KERR was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia and subcommittees thereof were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, six nominations are on the Executive Calendar. So far as I am aware, there is no objection to the confirmation of these nominations, and I should like to have them disposed of now. If the minority leader has any objection, I shall be glad to postpone the request for their consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Ohio refer to the new reports?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know of no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations under the heading "New Reports."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel C. Waugh, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria, and to be also United States High Commissioner for Austria.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold Shantz, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William D. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James W. Dorsey, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia, vice J. Ellis Mundy;

Leonard G. Hagner, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware, vice William Marvel;